Q. S. F.

TERTULLIANI
LIBER APOLOGETICUS.

THE

APOLOGY OF

TERTULLIAN,

WITH ENGLISH NOTES AND A PREFACE,

INTENDED AS AN

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF PATRISTICAL
AND ECCLESIASTICAL LATINITY.

BY

HENRY ANNESLEY WOODHAM, Esq. A.M. F.S.A.
FELLOW OF JESUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

CAMBRIDGE:
PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS,
FOR DEIGHTONS', CAMBRIDGE;
AND SOLD BY
RIVINGTONS', LONDON, AND PARKER, OXFORD.

M.DCCC.XLIII.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

CHAPTER II.

CHAPTER III.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

CHAPTER II.

CHAPTER III.



CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

CHAPTER II.

CHAPTER III.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE PLAN OF THE EDITION.

It was through a series of designs successively adopted and abandoned that I arrived at the idea of the short work which I here lay before the public, and although I shall not detain the reader with a history of discarded projects, yet I must request his attention through a few pages to an explanation of that which has been persevered in, in order that I may anticipate any charge of omission by declaring at the outset the character of the undertaking. The attention which has of late been drawn to the writings of the Fathers is matter of notoriety to every person of ordinary information, and various methods have been employed to place their sentiments and doctrines within reach of all who were likely to benefit by the knowledge. A very competent society in the sister University, has consulted the habits of two classes of readers by publishing an accurate text and a faithful translation of the several authors in question, and amongst ourselves, the resident members have not only been instructed on the subject by the authority of public lectures, but they have received a stimulus to private exertion, and there will probably be many who will carry into country retirement the advice of their

CHAP. I.

teacher[1], and after his suggestion, apply themselves to the pursuit of that satisfactory knowledge, which nothing but individual toil and patient study can secure. But neither a translation nor a text of the patristic writings is sufficient for the wants of the ordinary student. Of the first it need only be said, that all the well-known objections to versions even the most laboured and careful, apply with double force to the writings of the Fathers, which less than any remains of antiquity will bear to be transferred into a strange language; and as to the second; the confession of the committee themselves with respect to the author, whose works we are about to enter upon, will shew how much more remains to be done before the bare text of an African presbyter can be made available for reference or research. Nor is there any thing strange in the fact, that so much difficulty should be experienced in decyphering the Latin Fathers. It is quite impossible that the authors, whose age, or country, or contents make them serviceable to the illustration of Tertullian or Cyprian, should enter into the system of our classical studies or examinations; of those who devote themselves afterwards to the prosecution and advancement of their early labours, many prefer science to learning, and even to those who choose the latter, there is naturally more attraction in early Greek, than in late Latin. This subdivision of scholars leaves a very small number who can bring the requisite aid to the critical perusal of the Fathers, or who can master their style without very considerable trouble and delay; while with the less proficient class of students, who have no other preparatory information than that furnished by a respectable classical degree, or a good school education, and who, with an interval perhaps of three years from the one, and six from the other, commence the

[1] Introductory Lecture of the Lady Margaret Professor, pp. 13—15.

study of these writers, the perplexities are so great as to be almost effectually discouraging. Yet to these originals we must be sent, for it will hardly be said, that in this single department of learning we are to acquiesce in the information of others when we have the power of satisfying ourselves. And especially at this period, when a wider scheme of theological study is about to be put in operation, which embraces in some degree, and to a certain extent, the early patristic remains, it seems not inopportune to call attention to the *language* of those writers whose historical, and whose doctrinal information have been so earnestly insisted on, and so lucidly extracted, and to apply to this branch also of literature, that critical exactness and accuracy which has always so peculiarly characterised the classical scholarship of our University. It is this object which I have proposed to myself in the following pages; and in pursuing it, I have neglected many other points, not because they were not eminently important, but because they have been urged and investigated elsewhere. I have seldom drawn notice to any record, however remarkable, or to any narrative, however equivocal, as all this has been done by one[2] who has left little to be gleaned on this head from this particular writer, and to whose works I have contented myself with briefly referring. I have even passed over, or very sparingly illustrated, the numerous allusions to customs of antiquity and intricacies of mythology which this author supplies, for these will be readily recognized, or easily discovered. I have confined myself (at least as far as is consistent with the ordinary completeness of an edition) to the literal explanation of the text, as that is an aid which is not given

[2] The Ecclesiastical History of the second and third centuries illustrated from the writings of Tertullian by John, bishop of Bristol.

CHAP. I.

elsewhere, and which I hope may be found supplementary to the more important efforts of others. This is the key too, which will give access afterwards to whatever treasures are needed. I may here add the reasons which induced me to select for my operations this writer, and this especial treatise.

Tertullian is not only one of the most renowned, but he is the earliest of all the Latin Fathers, and this priority of date is of even more than usual consequence from the influence which his singular powers exerted on his successors, and which perpetuated certain characteristics through the writers of the African church for many years after him. His works too are the most important, excepting those of S. Augustine, both as regards the period at which they were written, and the mass of various information which they convey. Moreover, they are incomparably the most difficult, they shew the student the worst at once, and tell him what he has to expect; at the very outset he meets all the peculiarities of a declining language, of provincial, theological and polemical Latin, and he can, at all events, console himself with the reflection that he will not be much perplexed with any other pages after mastering these. It may be observed, though, that Tertullian has a double style, one for each of two distinct species of composition—his controversial, and his ethical, or apologetic tracts; and the first of these forms of itself a separate study, and a serious one too. Not only has his method of argument to be traced, his fidelity to be tested, and the worth of his witnesses to be weighed—which indeed are requisite preparations in most other cases—but his very language and its structure assume a new and peculiar character; strange words are compounded to express strange and mystical things, till at length the Latin tongue seems to fail absolutely in finding terms for the metaphysics or cos-

mogony of Marcion or Valentinus—ordinary words are stamped with a new superscription, and made current in dialectical negotiations with a certain value, which may indeed be preserved throughout, but which is received nowhere else—grammatical and logical subtleties are urged in the phraseology of the schools, and the figures of rhetoric are so pressed into service, irony especially, that it is exceedingly unsafe to acquiesce at once in what may appear the plain and literal acceptation of a sentence. And all this is superadded to the original impracticability of a style, which no one has ever studied without registering his protest against it. I was led by these circumstances to take one of the apologetic treatises as a subject for my attempts, as it was obviously advisable to investigate the natural sentiments and ordinary style of a writer before entering on any adventitious aggravations of character which circumstances might have induced; there is quite enough to engage us in Tertullian, considered as an African of the age of Severus, without at once introducing him also as a theologian, a schismatic, and a controversialist. I hope for a future opportunity of illustrating his tracts of this more obscure class, for they are vastly important both in extent and information, but at present, the Apology offered the best field for my own efforts, and the least disagreeable prospect to the reader. On the general utility of these Apologies, I shall offer a few remarks in a subsequent part of this introduction, and I am now speaking only of the comparative advantages which this one possesses over the other productions of its author. It is extremely interesting, not only as a glowing picture of the church and her fortunes at the commencement of the third century, but even in the lower light of an eloquent and powerful composition; it carries us irresistibly with it, and would do so if instead of

CHAP. I.

defending the Christians, it were pleading the cause of Scythians or Hindoos, and it is singularly free from the peculiar asperities and difficulties which have been alluded to above: it cannot be useless, for it is a piece of authentic history; it cannot be injurious, for it recommends nothing but justice; it cannot be offensive, for it deprecates nothing but cruelty; it advances no doctrine, it urges no discipline, it attacks no sect but Pagans, and inveighs against no characters but persecutors and murderers. It is no theological work, though written by a Christian and a presbyter; we may consider it as a valuable narrative composed in a most vigorous spirit, evidently by an eye witness and an actor in the scenes it describes, abounding with rich information and leaving indirectly a clearer and less questionable record of the state of things, than a direct history could have done. In one chapter only (the twenty-first) is there any approach to theological language or style; the rest is like any ethnical composition of the age, and capable of illustration in precisely the same manner, while at the same time it affords such copious exemplification of Tertullian's ordinary habits of thought and expresssion that no other single tract could serve better to introduce the rest.

It is to this work that I have applied such ability as I possess, with the simple object, it may be repeated, of rendering assistance to the student of patristic Latinity, and of recommending that accurate examination of language in the case of the Fathers which we never lose sight of in other cases, and which we know to be the only safe foundation on which a store of knowledge can be raised. In prosecuting this design I have first observed the fundamental rule of criticism, that every author is his own best interpreter, and I have illustrated any peculiar idiom pretty freely from the rest of

this writer's remains, especially from those ethical and other tracts which form this particular division of his works. I have then compared the authors of the nearest age, the same country, and the like profession, especially Cyprian, Arnobius, and Lactantius, and a circumstance which would otherwise increase nothing but the tedium of their perusal, has made these latter writers remarkably interesting and serviceable to this purpose. They all to a greater or less extent exerted themselves as the apologists of their fellow Christians; and as the absurdities of ancient polytheism, the passions of the dominant, and the sufferings of the persecuted, party continued from reign to reign with little mitigation or change, so the arguments of their defenders could not be expected materially to differ; the consequence is, that we find not only the pleas of Tertullian taken as the theme or burden of subsequent pieces, but even his language paraphrased and explained, and an obscure hint, a dark allusion, or an extraordinary idiom, amplified by the irregular redundance of Arnobius, or illustrated by the open translation of Minutius Felix. But I have not stopped here; when the language only is the subject of investigation, the works of any contemporary and fellow-countryman, however different may be his profession and his character are valuable in the extreme, and second only to those who unite to such recommendations the additional qualifications of similar aims and views; nor are we so well acquainted with African literature of the second and third centuries, that we can dispense with all aid from the writings of one who in the first of those periods was the greatest and the most celebrated of its profane and luxurious representatives. From the writings of Apuleius, to whom I am here alluding, we may collect the most important information concerning Carthage and the provinces; we learn the domestic habits

CHAP. I.

which Tertullian lashes, we see the theatres and spectacles against which he declaims, we attend the pomps and festivals of the deities which he exposes, and are introduced to the dark practices and magical arts to which he so frequently refers. And though it will be readily perceived how much even the knowledge of these circumstances is calculated to illustrate peculiarities of phraseology, yet still more apposite aid can be procured from the remains I speak of. Not only are all these communications conveyed in the same provincial dialect, and what is more, by a writer of similar education and analogous literary taste, but we have actually a counterpart composition, an apology of Apuleius, as well as of Tertullian, written indeed in a widely different spirit, pleading for private acquittal instead of public justice, refuting dirty scandal, instead of popular calumnies, savouring vastly more of ingenuity than innocence, but still written by an eloquent African, spoken before a Roman pro-consul in a Carthaginian court, addressed to the same ears to which the Christians pleaded, and possibly to many who might afterwards have read the apology of Tertullian. The very difference of these two productions is interesting and instructive, and while seizing a parallel idiom or a corresponding term it is edifying to contrast the confident complacency of an absolute rhetorician, with the serious and passionate tone of a man pleading for his life and for the truth. I have availed myself much and often of this author's aid on points of verbal criticism. In order too, that the peculiarities of the language which we are considering might be more exactly apprehended, I have frequently quoted the earlier or the intermediate Latin writers, either for an identical or an analogous expression, so that the transition sense of a word might be occasionally shewn, and the various changes exhibited which it experienced

in its passage from Rome to Carthage, from Cicero to Tertullian. I have been less sparing in my illustrations than I perhaps otherwise might have been, because my object was as much an introduction to the ordinary style of the Latin Fathers, and a general recommendation to accuracy in their perusal, as an explanation or commentary on this particular treatise, which indeed I only took because I thought that general assistance would be best given through the medium of a particular example, and because, as I before stated, this appeared to me especially eligible for the purpose. To carry out this plan a little further I have added a chapter on the Latinity of the African Fathers, in which I have briefly adverted to the characteristics of the class, and touched upon the distinctive properties of each individual, and I hope that this in conjunction with the notes at the foot of the text will enable the student to proceed with a little more ease through one portion of Tertullian's works, and through most of the remains of the other writers. I have observed, that in confining myself particularly to the verbal difficulties of the text, I have omitted the usual notices of mythological allusions, or doctrinal implications, but I have occasionally given a paraphrase of an intricate passage, or pointed out, to the best of my judgment, the thread of the argument where it appeared to be obscure, and I have thrown into a third chapter of this preface some remarks on the Apologetic writings of the early Christians, which include a special examination of the divisions, the arguments, and the spirit, of the present tract. Most readers will probably be aware that Tertullian composed two books *ad Nationes* for the same purpose as the Apology, and which correspond so closely with it that they must be either a rough draught of it, or an imperfect copy; these of course are peculiarly valuable in

CHAP. I.

the assistance which I noticed as supplied from other apologists, and I have placed marginal references to the corresponding passages both in these and in the Apology of Justin Martyr, that they may be thus compared. I believe I have only one more remark to add respecting the notes. Dr Ashton, Master of this college through the first half of the last century, bequeathed to the library several volumes enriched with his MS. notes, and amongst them the Leyden edition of this treatise by Havercamp, 1718. These notes are principally occupied in refuting and exposing the views of Havercamp (which indeed was no difficult matter) but they shew very good scholarship and clear perception of the author's true meaning. A few of these annotations by the permission of the college, I have selected; they are given in the original Latin of the Master, enclosed within brackets and distinguished by the initial A at the foot. The text has been taken mainly from the small Leipsic edition of 1841, by Leopold, with some few emendations of other editors; I have made no alteration or addition myself.

The whole of the sheets containing the text and notes had passed through the press, when the English translation of this Apology appeared amongst the periodical volumes of the Anglo-Catholic Society; I have not yet had time to read it, but if it should prove that any of my interpretations of disputed passages coincide with the translator's views, I shall be very glad of the sanction and support of such publications.

CHAPTER II.

ON THE LATINITY OF THE AFRICAN FATHERS.

It was my belief, when I commenced investigating this subject, that I should be able to collect certain characteristics from the language of these writers, peculiar to them as a class, but common to all of them amongst themselves, and that, by carefully comparing the dialects of other authors of the same country, such as Apuleius and Macrobius, I might approximate to a general illustration of African Latinity. But, the further I advanced, the less practicable appeared the completion of any such scheme, and the fewer points of character could I finally select which fulfilled the conditions mentioned above, the greater number of them appearing always, when strictly examined, to be either common to writers of other schools, or *not* common to all writers of this. I cannot therefore offer to the reader such systematic aid as I had hoped in his prosecution of the studies in question, but he may possibly derive advantage from the observations which I made during my researches, and I therefore subjoin some of them, though in a form unconnected and incomplete.

The first point to which our consideration is naturally directed in such enquiries as these, is the influence which the vernacular language of an author's native country may have exerted on the language in which he writes, and if we happen to be acquainted with both of these, we have little difficulty in tracing the operations of the former. The Syro-Chaldaisms of the New Testament Greek, are nearly as perceptible and intelligible

CHAP. II.

as the Hebraized Latinity of the Vulgate; we recognize easily a Jewish author in one, and the closeness of a literal translation in the other. But, in the present case, we know little or nothing of the ordinary dialects of Africa, and when its writers come before us, and we detect in their works any novelties or singularities of expression, our only ground for concluding them to be *Africanisms*, must be either scholastic tradition, or the fact that we cannot account for them in any other way; and if, in their several remains any analogy be discoverable between such singularities, this conclusion is of course strengthened.

But there are peculiarities of style, as well as of idiom, and these are not only more readily detected and compared, but more generally traceable to their causes. As early as the time of Juvenal, Africa was celebrated for its schools of rhetoric, and though they were probably not distinguished for their purity or elegance, yet it was a matter of notoriety, that the study and practice of eloquence met with greater encouragement in this province than at Rome[1]. Nor does it appear at all to have declined during the second or third centuries, for most of the ecclesiastical writers of these times, who were not Christians born, seem to have been members of this profession. Tertullian had most obviously more than an ordinary knowledge of its technicalities, Cyprian devoted his youth and much of his manhood to it[2]; Arnobius and Lactantius taught rhetoric for their living. We can conjecture pretty accurately what would be the result of such a state of things as this, when, with a declining language and a

[1] Juv. VII. 147.

.... accipiat te
Gallia, vel potius nutricula causidicorum
Africa, si placuit mercedem ponere linguæ.

[2] See Mr Evans in his life of Cyprian, Theol. Lib. xv. p. 141.

CHAP. II.

corrupt age, the ordinary years of study were monopolized by the exercises of the schools. An overwhelming importance would be attached to such proprieties or beauties of speech as the fashion of the day had sanctioned, to the comparative exclusion of thought, or even truth, as objects of consideration. Apuleius says in one of his speeches, that he knows his audience will not pardon him a single mistake, or excuse a single solecism, or overlook a single mispronunciation[3], and he exhibits in his own productions a most remarkable portrait of the character formed under this system, and a most complete picture of what was demanded by an African audience. His celebrated apology, the masterpiece of the day, the admiration of even Christian writers[4], is a deliberate display of all the arts, powers, and subtleties of rhetoric; truth, though repeatedly appealed to, is virtually put out of the question; the orator plays with the charges against him like a master of fence with a couple of raw antagonists, after rebutting an accusation he offers to acknowledge it, and clear himself on another ground, his opponents may take as many points as they like to make the game even, he has no objection to plead guilty, or not guilty, his final exculpation of himself will be just as successful in either case. We can be at no loss after reading the apology of Apuleius, to understand the meaning of Tertullian, when he says, *Quis nos revincere audebit, non arte verborum, sed eadem forma qua probationem constituimus de veritate?* It is not the least singular point about this extraordinary speech, that one of the charges against the speaker was *his eloquence.*

[3] "Quis enim vestrum unum mihi solæcismum ignoverit? quis vel unam syllabam barbare pronuntiatam donaverit? quis incondita et vitiosa verba temere, quasi delirantibus oborientia, permiserit blatterare?" Florid. I. 9.

[4] S. Augustine, Ep. v. ad Marcell. and elsewhere.

CHAP. II.

It is clear that the Christian writers, as a body, notwithstanding their original education, fell short of the standard which the polished taste of the provincial public had fixed upon, nay, it appears from Arnobius, that a crime no less heinous than that of using *false concords* had been laid at their doors, and so completely does this writer forget the grammarian in the apologist, that he does not hesitate to urge the revolutionary argument that all tenses and cases are equal, that genders are but conventionally, and not essentially, different, and that *hæc paries* and *hic sella* may be written with as much moral accuracy as *hæc sella* and *hic paries*[1]. He opens his own treatise with the preface, that he has come to the determination of defending his cause *pro captu ac mediocritate sermonis*, and Lactantius, as will be observed in another place (c. III.) remarks specially of Tertullian, and generally of all the apologists, that they failed in the elegance of speech requisite to recommend their works.

Yet they have undoubtedly one or two features common to the more successful candidates for popular admiration among their countrymen, and which are owing to the same influence of fashion on both. When a language, already advanced in its decline, is made the subject of fastidious study for the purposes which have been spoken of, its early monuments will be naturally resorted to as models, by men who are quite able to detect the faults of a later age; but other examples besides the present, shew us that this practice is likely both to be pursued in a wrong spirit and carried too

[1] "Quid enim officit, o! quæso ......aut qui minus id quod dicitur verum est, si in numero peccatur, aut casu, præpositione, participio, conjunctione?" I. 34. "Quanquam (si verum spectes) nullus sermo natura est integer, vitiosus similiter nullus. Quænam est enim ratio naturalis, aut in mundi constitutionibus lex scripta, ut *hic* paries dicatur," &c. ib. 35.

CHAP. II.

far. It is pursued in a wrong spirit when men, instead of imitating chasteness of description, or vigour of thought, or severity of style, from the early writers, content themselves with borrowing isolated words, often without preserving even the regimen; and it is carried too far when antiquity alone is made a sufficient recommendation, for a language may be as barbarous in its origin as in its decline. Both the passion and its excesses are fully exemplified in the writers before us, almost every page of them will supply specimens of archaisms of the most extraordinary nature, which the reader at first imagines must necessarily be the coinage of the writer, but which he perhaps will be able to trace clearly beyond the age of Ennius[2]. This character runs through all the African writers, and is remarkably stamped on Apuleius, where its artificial nature may be readily seen. The celebrated *novel* of this author is composed in a most singular dialect; if it were not that it goes on so smoothly and equably from beginning to end, it would seem to be in a forced or feigned hand; it is not like any other prose, and yet it is not verse, but runs on in a kind of chant, like that said to be used by eastern story-tellers; almost every noun has an epithet, and frequently both are diminutives[3];

[2] This has more than once been the subject of remark. Bishop Kaye says, "When I have myself been obliged to consult the dictionaries for the meaning of some strange and portentous word which crossed me in my perusal of Tertullian's works, I have occasionally found that it had been used by Plautus." Eccl. Hist. p. 68. Gilbert Wakefield, in his edition of Lucretius, after expressing his belief that a vast body of old Latinity is contained in Tertullian, Apuleius, and Arnobius, ventures on the ingenious but somewhat equivocal experiment of amending his own text with words taken from these authors, and thus employing, as it were, an unattested copy to restore a decayed original.

[3] The constant use of these forms might perhaps seem peculiar to African Latin, but, though Tertullian employs them

CHAP. II.

the galliambics of Catullus, if printed in the shape of prose, would give no bad idea of the rythm of several passages in Apuleius. The same remarks apply, in rather a less degree, to his philosophical works, and in all these the most obsolete archaisms meet us at every step; but in the apology, and (of course) the Florida[1], it is evident that he has considered it necessary to discard this fashion in a measure, and to use more the language of every day life. But even here obsolete words are very numerous. I have observed that this is a character which is common to all the writers in question, but it is not peculiar to them, it appears as strongly in Aulus Gellius (who certainly had the excuse of his subject) as in any of them, it seems the character not of the school or the country, but of the age. Another very striking feature in the African writers is their bombastic style, which has even been distinguished by the title of *tumor Africanus*, and unquestionably it prevails to a greater or less degree,—least in Lactantius, greatest in Arnobius—throughout them all. But, like the archaisms, it is no peculiar note of an African; Ammianus exceeds all of them in luxuriance of style or inflated language[2]. The difference between

a good deal (see p. 158) yet Arnobius but seldom uses them.

[1] The Florida are a collection of striking passages from speeches of Apuleius, a kind of Elegant Extracts, probably compiled by some admirer of the author, and now all that we possess of the original compositions.

[2] I would not omit to mention the great familiarity which all these writers display with the Roman poets, and I allude less to the copious quotations of Lactantius than to the almost insensible allusions of the others, which intimate not only their own perfect acquaintance with the poetry, but a presumption of some such knowledge in those whom they addressed. For instance, Minutius (c. 18) writes, "Quando unquam regni societas aut cum fide cœpit, aut sine cruore discessit. . . . . Generi et soceri bella toto orbe diffusa sunt et tam magni imperii duos fortuna non cepit," which is a paraphrase of Lucan (I. 92, 109.)

CHAP. II.

these and other writers of Latin which appears to me most idiomatic in character is not in words, nor in their government, but in the construction of sentences of which the involution is sometimes so intricate and strange, that it seems hardly possible to attribute it to any fanciful collocation of words, but we are compelled to refer it to some other influence, and, most probably, that of another tongue. I had, at one time, collected a few of these sentences to illustrate my remarks, but I found that I could make no arrangement or classification of them, and that I could give no general rule towards their quicker comprehension; and as their quotation would thus be only a simple specimen of what the student will readily enough find for himself, I thought they would be uselessly inserted. There are of course many words and expressions occurring in the African Fathers which will be new to a beginner, but I know of no general formula by which these can be summarily explained; such as are most remarkable in the present treatise are arranged in the index to the volume, and if the corresponding notes be referred to, a short illustration will be found of each, with occasional observations on its usage and date. As I have quoted freely, too, from other authors of this character, some idea may be formed of their ordinary style and idiom, and

Nulla fides regni sociis, omnisque potestas
Impatiens consortis erit. . . . .
. . . .
populique potentis
Quæ mare quæ terras quæ totum possidet orbem
Non cepit fortuna duos.

Lucan indeed seems to have been a favourite author with them, and Lucretius even more especially so. The fact was that the poets (Juv. 7) formed one of the principal branches of study in the rhetorical schools, and their phraseology and ornaments were transferred to the speeches of the day in which these florid decorations were now required. "Exigitur enim *jam* ab oratore etiam poeticus decor," says either Tacitus or Quintilian, "non Attii aut Pacuvii veterno inquinatus, sed et Horatii et Virgilii et *Lucani* sacrario prolatus." de Causs. Corr. Eloq. c. 20.

CHAP. II.

I cannot, at present, see any more compendious way of arriving at the knowledge. I have drawn up, on the opposite page, a short table of the writers whose works may be mutually brought to bear upon each other, in illustration either of language or subject; those whose names are mentioned in the first column are of course most closely connected; in the second, Apuleius will be found to supply very numerous parallelisms, and Ulpianus and Paulus will be serviceable in explaining that large class of words, in these authors, of forensic origin.

I have but a few words to add on the peculiarities of each individual. Tertullian makes frequent use of metaphors, which are drawn very often indeed from legal and from military sources, his probable profession explaining the first circumstance, and his father's the second; he is extremely fond of an antithetical play upon words; for the sole sake of which the sentence appears sometimes constructed and inserted; several instances will be found in this treatise e.g. (p. 11), *ut nolint scire pro certo, quod se nescire pro certo sciunt.* (p. 170), *ad lenonem potius quam ad leonem damnando.* (p. 17), *merito damnantur licet damnent*, &c. His passion for paradox has been often remarked; probably most readers will recollect hearing of his celebrated argument *certum est quia impossibile*,—and these facts should be the more steadily kept sight of, that they influence not only his assertions but his language. I feel convinced that some of Tertullian's extraordinary expressions are to be properly explained by reference to other clauses of the sentence, and that a word though somewhat inappropriate was used because it formed an exact antithesis to another. But the most perplexing and perilous habit of Tertullian is, as I have before hinted, his *irony*. In the midst of the most serious argument, on the most serious subject, without the warning of a word he slides

CHAP. II.

A. D.	CHRISTIAN WRITERS.	A. D.	HEATHEN WRITERS.	A. D.	ROMAN EMPERORS.
195	Tertullianus.	165	Apuleius.	180	Commodus.
210	Minutius Felix.			193	Septimius Severus.
250	S. Cyprianus.	220	*Ulpianus* et *Paulus*.	211	Caracalla.
270	Commodianus.		Historiæ Augustæ Scriptores. (*towards the end of the century.*)	253	Valerius.
300	Arnobius.				Gallienus.
				270	Aurelianus.
317	Lactantius.			284	Diocletianus.
				286	Maximinus.
		380	*Ammianus Marcellinus*.		
				292	Galerius et Constantius *Cæsares*
		395	Macrobius.		
				324	Constantinus.
397	*Prudentius*.	397	*Claudianus*.		

*** The names in italics are those of writers not African.

CHAP. II.

into the gravest imaginable irony, and again returns to his direct course so unexpectedly, and after such various intervals, that nothing but the most habitual conversation with his writings can enable us to detect him. I have noticed (p. 121) one instance in which even Mosheim was strangely misled, and I have pointed out in the notes the examples of this singular practice as they occurred. The young student of Tertullian can never be too much on his guard on this point.

While speaking of Tertullian's style, there is one singular circumstance to which I may allude. That Semler surmised and endeavoured to prove that the *whole* of Tertullian's works were spurious, and the production of a joint-stock establishment at Rome, is probably known to many through Bishop Kaye's refutation of the argument. (Eccl. Hist. p. 69, sqq.) But, apart from all such reasoning, I am at a loss to conceive how such an idea could ever have been entertained by any one who had been accustomed to compare the genuine and counterfeit writings of antiquity. Not to mention the earnestness, the reality, of Tertullian's works, could any rhetorician possibly have devised such a style as this? or could he have preserved it throughout? or could any body else successfully have imitated it? It is actually impossible.

There is nothing very peculiar about the language of Cyprian; neither his mind nor his style had the deeply-cut features of Tertullian; he was thought eloquent in his day, too eloquent indeed, by the heathen, for a subject so insignificant as religion[1]; his sentences (comparatively) run fluently and smoothly, and he often explains some sententious dictum of Tertullian by a lucid para-

[1] "A doctis hujus sæculi, quibus forte scripta ejus innotuerunt, derideri solet . . . . quasi qui elegans ingenium, et melioribus rebus aptum, ad aniles fabulas contulisset." Lactant. D. I. v. i.

phrase. Arnobius has some resemblance to Apuleius, his descriptions are of the most astonishing luxuriance, they wander through page after page with all kinds of rhetorical embellishments; he has very frequent examples of that involution of construction mentioned above, but the general arrangement of his sentences and periods is remarkably constant, so that after an attentive perusal of a few chapters the reader may know exactly where to expect the epithets and the verbs, and precisely anticipate the rythm and the cadence. Lactantius is by far the most free from the general faults of this age, and by almost as much the most uninteresting of its writers. His style, on which he so prides himself, and which others have given him so much credit for, is the most disagreeable of all styles, a spiritless imitation of Ciceronian Latin, the weakness of which is particularly apparent after the perusal of Tertullian. It happens that there are several passages[2] in these two authors so parallel in substance that they can be most advantageously compared, and the student will thus easily learn how little an affectation of conventional elegancies will compensate for a total absence of vividness or vigour. If Cicero must needs be the sole and exclusive exemplar for modern composition, it is strange that his Orations at least are not sometimes resorted to, instead of those philosophical treatises the style of which was never intended to convey any sentiment more forcible than a gentlemanly deference to a friend's opinion, or a polite dissent from a self-evident absurdity. Many scholars have stood up in defence of Tertullian's arguments, but all, except Gilbert Wakefield, have joined in decrying his Latinity as preeminently vicious. I can only say that whatever may be its obscurities and deformities on a first acquaintance, few readers after becoming well

[2] See note on c. 50.

CHAP. II.

habituated to its peculiarities will quit it for more polished compositions of the same date without experiencing something unpleasant in the change, and something agreeable in the return to it; some chapters of this treatise even in point of structure and mechanism are equal to any thing in ancient Latin, and it seems really difficult to imagine that they were not actually spoken, or at all events written for oral delivery. Some allowance too must be made for the subjects on which he is frequently employed. If Lucretius with all his advantages was compelled to excuse his phraseology by the rudeness of his theme, we may surely supply the same apology to Tertullian; Valentinus was at least as intractable as Anaxagoras, and the ὀγδοὰς as unmanageable a material as the ὁμοιομέρεια. At all events I hope that not every student will agree in the denunciations which a very favourite writer has thus heaped on this unfortunate African.

"Truly Roman rudeness and insolence which not "even the power of Christian grace could thoroughly "tame (so innately savage was the nature of this beast "of prophecy) address us in the provincial roughness of "an obscure and difficult language. From the natural "heartlessness and treacherous reserve of its speakers "the Latin delights in a vague phraseology and oblique "construction which hints rather than expresses, and "reminds us that the language of the robbers of the "world was no unfit vehicle also for the sentiments of "the crafty tyrants of the church[1]."

To trace in an unfavoured language the faults of an hundred generations, to visit on a solitary supine or a double dative the rapacity of a host of Cæsars and the presumptions of a line of Popes, is surely as relentless an attack as any which Mr Evans himself has

[1] Theol. Lib. xiv. p. 358.

reprehended in Tertullian, and the cut is the harder and unkinder from an implied contrast of the dialects and temperance of the Greeks. Even admitting the essential morality of the Ionic tongue, we may pause before conceding to the countrymen of Alcibiades the praise of continence or honesty. Few writers know better than Mr Evans what portraits might be drawn of Athenian philosophers, Athenian statesmen, or Athenian citizens; if they did not rob the world it was only because they could not, if they could have bound the strong man they would speedily have spoiled his goods; with all the propensity to plunder, they wanted the steadiness to subdue. But especially must I differ from any opinion that Latin is not a fitting language for theological or ecclesiastical purposes; this is not a point for logical argument, but a question involving a variety of indefinite considerations; very possibly παλιγγενεσία may to many appear a harmonious, and *regeneratio* a barbarous, term, but the man must be strangely biassed by some previous influence who can read or hear without something more than admiration the magnificent Latin of the antient Liturgies.

CHAPTER III.

ON THE APOLOGETIC WRITINGS OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS.

The ancient apologists for Christianity have been divided into two classes, the first, of advocates who were pleading their cause in times of persecution before emperors or provincial governors; and the second, of didactic and voluntary expositors of their creed and practice. But on closer examination it will appear, that the two divisions are intimately connected, and that the first, though composed of writers who certainly had no idea of offering what, in the present day, would be called *evidences* of Christianity, are nevertheless as available for such testimony as the other class, whose aim was more avowedly the conversion of their fellow men. An instance of this may be seen in the process by which Grotius has proved the truth of the Christian religion; and as I may take occasion to compare his scheme of evidence, as well as Paley's, with the earlier writers now under consideration, I will here sketch his general argument in as few words as possible, that I may refer to it presently, if occasion should require. Of his six books, the first, through the media of certain proofs with which we are not here concerned, establishes the proposition that there must be a *vera religio* somewhere; the second considers the claim of Christianity to this title, the third examines the genuineness of Holy Scripture, and the rest are devoted to the refutation of Paganism, Judaism, and Mahometanism. His steps in the second book are these; he shews that

CHAP. III.

the life and crucifixion of our Lord, as facts, cannot be denied by any one, and also that after his death he was worshipped *etiam viris sapientibus*, and that for this the *only* assignable cause is to be found in the divine miracles which they had carefully examined and approved[1]. This chapter contains the cardinal point of Grotius' proof, and differs in this from Paley's, that, whereas both advocates make the miracles decisive of the question, the latter draws his evidence from the sufferings of the first martyrs, while the former rests on the circumstances of the conversion of the early Fathers. But if the corroboration of certain facts is to be sought in the conversion of certain persons, it will be seen at once of what singular importance are the writings of these persons, which serve almost as autobiographies, and which shew the evidence to which they yielded, when they detail its nature, and urge its examination on others[2]. And this is one very interesting and instructive light in which the early apologists may be viewed. My present intention however is merely to compensate in some degree, for the strictness with which, in this edition, I have confined myself to philo-

[1] De Verit. II. 4. "Fuerunt autem semper, inter cultores Christi, plurimi et judicio præditi, et literarum non rudes, quales (ut de Judæis nunc taceamus) Sergius Cypri præses, Dionysius Areopagita, Polycarpus, Justinus, Iræneus, Athenagoras, Origenes, Tertullianus, Clemens Alexandrinus, ac porro alii, qui tales cum essent, cur homini ignominiosa morte affecto se cultores addixerint, ... nulla potest caussa reddi præter hanc unam, quod diligenti inquisitione, qualis viros prudentes in maximi momenti negotio decet, comperissent veram et firmis testibus subnixam fuisse famam, quæ de miraculis ab eo editis percrebuerat." The conclusion of this book is not to our purpose, but Grotius employs it in proving the resurrection, and drawing thence additional arguments; and in shewing the ethical excellency of Christianity.

[2] Such writings are the Apology here edited, the λόγος προτρεπτικὸς of Clement, the παραίνεσις of Justin, and the Apologies anterior to Tertullian.

CHAP. III.

logical and grammatical points, and to offer the young student a little insight into some of the apologetic writings with which he is perhaps unacquainted, as well as to give a general idea of the scheme and character of that particular apology which I have taken as a subject for illustration. I am compelled to take somewhat narrow limits, and I have therefore preferred keeping to the same authors who have been reviewed for another purpose in the previous section, which I do the more readily, that their writings happen *all* to bear, more or less, on this subject, and that in them are included three of the names most celebrated in this species of composition. Two writers only of any especial note will be thus excluded, Origen and St Augustine, the former of whom, from the nature of his work, cannot be compared exactly with those lately spoken of, and the latter I have reserved for a separate examination as regards both his matter and his language; the apologists anterior to Tertullian may be considered, for all practical purposes, as fairly represented in him. The first column of the table given in the last section will shew the respective dates of the apologists (for such they may all be termed) whose essays are now to be considered, and it will be there seen that the third century, within a very few years, includes them all. They comprise specimens of both of the divisions above mentioned, and even if no more profitable information were to be gained from their perusal, it would be both curious and interesting to trace the tone, varying with the times, from the abrupt and passionate entreaty for justice and toleration, through the argumentative expositions betokening comparative security, to the final protest against the pitiable relics of paganism.

The apologists of Christianity, from the very essence of the religion they taught, were compelled to attack the

superstitions, whose dominions they might perhaps quietly have been permitted to share; and to assert, with some, that they were more undeniably successful in defeating their adversaries than in defending themselves, is but to detect an example of a truism. No controversy has ever taken place, either concerning science or metaphysics, matters of fact, or matters of opinion, which would not supply occasion for similar remarks, and if they who urged them in the present case had been met with their own argument, and requested to state their creed instead of their objections, they would probably have added another illustration to the rule. As Lactantius[1] said of the old philosophers, *gladium habent, scutum non habent.* But it does not very clearly appear how any wit or zeal could be called "superfluous[2]," which was directed against extravagancies actually prevailing and openly defended, and against a polytheism of which the absurdities were disguised and relieved by antiquity and associations. Nevertheless—though it is not very prudent in us at this distance of time and with such insufficient knowledge of the circumstances to pronounce an opinion—we must yet admit that in certain respects the apologies of either class seem less calculated to effect their purposes than we might have expected from the strength of their cause; and indeed we may withhold our private judgment and cite one of the writers themselves to confirm the fact and offer his explanation of it. Lactantius in a remarkable passage[3], informs us that those

CHAP. III.

[1] Inst. Div. III. 4.

[2] Gibbon, c. xv. ad extr.

[3] Inst. Div. v. 1, 2. "Si qui forte literatorum se ad eam contulerunt, defensioni ejus non suffecerunt. Ex iis qui mihi noti sunt Minutius Felix non ignobilis inter caussidicos loci fuit. Hujus liber cui Octavio titulus est declarat quam idoneus veritatis assertor esse potuisset si se totum ad id studium contulisset. Septimius quoque Tertullianus fuit omni genere literarum peritus sed in eloquendo parum facilis et minus comptus et multum ob-

CHAP. III.

of the learned men who embraced the Gospel were unequal to its defence, that they neither had attractiveness, nor keenness, nor sarcasm sufficient for the times, and that in consequence of this failure the doctrines of Christianity remained unknown to those who required polished language and philosophical argument, while its opponents kept undisputed possession of the field of rhetoric. I merely cite this at present for the facts recorded in it; —the consideration due to the writer's opinion, and the value of his attempt to supply the presumed *desideratum*, will be discussed afterwards in their proper place.

The adversaries to whom the apologetic writings would be chiefly addressed, may be divided into three principal classes; the Pagans, who supported, either from upright or interested motives the old religion, such as Symmachus, whose Apology for Paganism will be presently noticed; the philosophers who either ridiculed or allegorized it, and the Jews. In the first class was to be found that vast multitude of converts which was to fulfil the prophecies of Scripture, and with these, if sincerely disposed to religious views, the dissection of their mythology and the representation of their deities in a true light would be specially efficacious. In the second was a far smaller, but far more dangerous body of opponents, whose tenets indeed were much at variance with each other, some receding directly from Christianity, some making a kind of approximation to its doctrines, but all nearly equally pernicious. The Epicurean was the most intractable of all. Arnobius, though the keenest (in my opinion) of the apologists, and certainly in some respects most ap-

scurus. Ergo ne hic quidem satis celebritatis invenit. Unus igitur præcipuus et clarus exstitit Cyprianus .... quid tandem putemus eis accidere quorum sermo jejunus est et ingratus, qui neque vim persuadendi neque subtilitatem argumentandi neque ullam prorsus acerbitatem ad revincendum habere potuerunt? Ergo quia defuerunt," &c.

posite to the popular arguments of modern times, avows at the outset of his work that he cannot enter into any controversy with those who deny or doubt the existence of a Creator[1], and even Lactantius with all his complacency towards his own philosophical and argumentative powers leaves to its own merits the protest of the Epicurean against the postulate from which he takes his start[2]. There was no competing with an adversary who could stand on no common ground with the believer in any religion whatever. It is said that Celsus concealed his adherence to this sect, and as upon the whole it seems most probable that he was really one of its followers, he might perhaps wish to disguise a fact which would thus raise an antecedent prejudice against any objections he might urge. The Platonist was the nearest in character to Christianity and perhaps the best disposed to receive its creed, but one staggering obstacle more insuperable in his case even than in that of the others[3], would check his kindly feelings, and the Neo-Platonics shewed soon that the sensible approximation of Platonism to Christianity was not a circumstance in which the latter could rejoice. It may be very true, as stated by Origen, that the tenets of the philosophers were but little known and scantily influential on the mass of society compared with the precepts of the gospel, and independently of any testimony we should be at no loss for arguments to shew that such a state of things was extremely probable;—but this is quite consistent with their serious and effective hostility. The schools of philosophy were like fortresses in an open country, which cannot actually hinder the march of an invading

[1] I. 16. "cum quibus hoc tempore nullum nobis omnino super tali erit obstinatione certamen..... Sermo cum his nobis est qui divinum esse consentientes genus," &c.

[2] D. I. I. 2.

[3] See Neander. Ch. Hist. I. p. 165, Mr Rose's translation.

CHAP. III.

army, but which no skilful general will leave in his rear without storming or masking. They offered to the vacillating mind, some an adumbration, some a refutation, of the Christian doctrines, and in several cases they would recall the unstable and half-confirmed convert, especially if his education and acquirements chanced to be a little superior[1]. Against such opponents the simplest course was to exhibit their mutual discord and to leave them to the result of civil war; and as the premises of each individual scheme consisted generally in the contemptuous rejection of every other, there was little difficulty in drawing a conclusion fatal to them all[2]. The third class mentioned was that of the Jews, and their affinity to the new sect seems to have regulated the virulence of their enmity, from a complication of motives which it is very easy to imagine; Tertullian in characterizing the various enemies of the Truth[3], mentions in very expressive terms *proprii ex æmulatione Judæi*, and some influence so repulsive seems to have existed, that even conversion did not always effect a permanent change, as we may collect from the history of the secession to Pella, and the casual remark of Justin Martyr[4], that the converts from Judaism were not only less numerous than those from Paganism, but less *sincere*. All these classes joined eagerly in persecuting the Christians; the Pagans, as the executive, being instigated by the example of the Jews and the writings of the philosophers, for it is worth remarking, that the most celebrated attacks on Christianity were published during the very worst of the persecutions. The

[1] D. I. v. 1. Nutant enim plurimi, et maxime qui litterarum aliquid attigerunt.

[2] Ibid. III. 4. pereunt igitur universi hoc modo, et tanquam sparti illi poetarum, sic se invicem jugulant ut nemo ex omnibus restet.

[3] c. VII. p. 24.

[4] Apol. I. c. 68.

Roman governor might belong either to the first or second division, as chance determined, or very probably might partake of the character of both. To some one of these parties or individuals were the arguments addressed which are contained in the apologetic writings, and with such reference must we consider them when we are venturing an opinion on their applicability or power. It is true that the exposure of an incredible theology or impure ceremonial might indeed have been superfluous when offered to an Epicurean who had been long ridiculing all of them in secret, but they were efficacious with another class, to whom they were peculiarly directed; and in like manner though a Pagan might be expected to undervalue an argument from prophecies which he neither knew nor credited, yet with a Jew this was almost the only open course of proceeding, as Tertullian clearly shews when he states[5] that the most desperate struggle between the Jews and Christians was on this very point, as each party cited the same evidence of prophecy in support of their cause. It is therefore an unfair though an easy method of depreciating these writers, to test the value of their arguments by a reference to the sentiments of parties to whom they were *not* addressed; some treatises too would naturally contain an admixture of the several pleas to meet the probability of a promiscuous audience; and if any essay even with these allowances should still appear inapt or injudicious, we may recollect how singularly liable is every writer to be unconsciously influenced as well by his own feelings as those presumed in his readers, and to display the particular facts and urge the peculiar arguments which had the greatest weight with himself. There is one more remark which at this period I wish to make. In considering any supernatural events

[5] c. xxi.

CHAP. III.

there are two points to which the attention may be directed; the evidence of *testimony* and the evidence of *argument;* the first through the medium of those rules which guide us in every transaction of life, and by which the society of the human race is preserved, establishes certain occurrences as *matters of fact;* the second is concerned in proving the same proposition by reference to their probability, their analogy to other occurrences, their object, their utility, and a variety of circumstances of the like nature; one asserts the truth, the other the reasonableness, of a scheme. Both these may of course be united, and directed to the same end; a well-constituted mind will admit the sufficiency of the first proof and acquiesce in its consequences, but with others no conceivable completeness of the evidence of testimony is allowed to prevail against a presumed deficiency in the evidence of argument, an evidence always indefinite, and varying in each individual case as to the fulness and character requisite to secure its acceptance, so that an exclusive appeal to it amounts to little more than an unlimited claim to private judgment in every imaginable cause. This point will be found discussed at some length and with considerable acuteness in Cicero's very interesting treatise *De Divinatione*, where the testimonies *for* that particular kind of supernatural interference are alleged in the first book, and the arguments *against* it produced in the second; the two following sentences will give the reader the pith of each, and some inference may be drawn as to the probable opinions of an educated heathen on this subject.

A. Si nihil queam disputare, quamobrem quidque fiat, et tantummodo, fieri ea, quæ commemoravi, doceam: parum ne respondeam? (I. 49.)

B. Hoc ego philosophi non esse arbitror, testibus uti: qui aut casu veri, aut malitia falsi fictique esse

possunt: argumentis et rationibus oportet quare quidque ita sit, docere, non eventis, iis præsertim quibus mihi liceat non credere. (II, 11.) CHAP. III.

We shall presently see the different views taken by the apologists of this subject amongst others, and our end will be best answered by examining first the apology of Tertullian, so that by using this as a criterion to which the others may be applied, we shall the more easily detect their mutual difference or agreement on any considerable points, and observe better the ends which they respectively proposed to themselves, and the means they employed to accomplish them.

Tertullian's treatise is generally divided into fifty chapters as I have given it, and to these I shall make reference. The opening (c. 1—7) is entirely devoted to proving that the authorities ought really to hear what the Christians had to say for themselves, and after some very characteristic reasoning on this point the writer is naturally compelled to retort those peculiarly infamous charges which would, if true, have almost justified the conduct of the heathen (7—10). He then (c. 10) states two of the chief accusations brought against the Christians, viz. first, that they refused to worship the gods, and secondly, that they did not offer sacrifice for the emperor. The former of these is discussed, with some incidental digressions, through eighteen chapters (10—27), and the latter through eight (28—37); some minor objections to Christian practice are then refuted (37—45), and the peroration (45—50) is occupied by contrasting with the merits and persecutions of the Christians the deserts and the treatment of the several philosophical schools. It must be obvious from the first sight of this synopsis that the Apology was not written with any direct intention or idea of making converts, or of proving the truth of the Christian religion. The

CHAP. III.

case to be shewn is *quid sit liquido in caussa Christianorum;* the end to be gained is *ne ignorata damnetur.* Tertullian endeavours to prove not that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, or that the Evangelists left a true and harmonious narrative, but that infanticide and incest were not crimes of the Christians, that their assemblies were not seditious, and that their habits were neither hurtful to society, nor vicious in themselves. It is difficult to make always due allowance for the bitter irony and passionate language of this writer, but we can scarcely be wrong in inferring from his pleading that at this precise period the misery of the Christians must have reached its height. He seems scarcely to hope for their acquittal, or to think of bargaining for it, but confines his petition to a request that they may be heard before they are condemned, and tried in some cases before they are executed; and after shewing at length not merely the negative but the positive virtues of Christian habits, his demand is only that they should not be treated with any thing more severe than ridicule. I observed however above, that, in the discussion of the first charge brought against his brethren, Tertullian had introduced some incidental digressions, but though the chapters alluded to (17—23 inclusively) may be made in strictness perhaps to bear that term, since the defence might have continuously proceeded through all its main points without them, yet they are the most seriously important of any in the treatise. They detail the nature and attributes of the Creator, the mission of the Prophets, the character of the Scriptures, and the history of Our Lord, forming what Tertullian calls *demonstrationem religionis nostræ* (16 extr.)

This therefore is evidently the portion of the Apology to which we must turn for any approximation to *evidences* of Christianity, though even this will only indirectly and

unavoidably assume such a character. It was not intended for any such object, but it would very probably attract attention to the real principles of the sect, and induce a curious heathen *inquirere et intelligere et credere*,—a process frequently alluded to by Tertullian in these very words, and which implies an examination of other sufficient and accessible evidence beyond any contained in the document recommending such a course of research. Still this episodical relic is extremely valuable, and even when confined to simple affirmations it has all that weight which a luminous and straight-forward statement invariably carries with it. It is introduced naturally by the expediency of shewing what Christianity *is*, after proving what it was *not*. The writer commences (c. 17) with an attempt to delineate the attributes of that God whom the Christians worshipped, and he adduces the very remarkable testimony of the soul[1] to prove the universal recognition of this truth. He then states (c. 18) that the will of this Being has always from the first (*a primordio*) been communicated to man through Prophets divinely inspired, and that their precepts (*voces eorum*) together with a record of their miraculous credentials were committed to authentic narratives, and he shews the accessibility of these narratives by a circumstantial detail of the translation of the LXX. He has thus arrived at the Scriptures, (the Old Testament), and he is of course compelled to offer some evidence for their authority. On this point his first argument is a remarkable one, drawn from their *antiquity*, in which he shews that no historical or literary remains of any ancient kingdom will bear any comparison with the Volume in question; and after interposing a few confirmatory remarks, he points out a method by which the fact may be systematically proved. I have termed this argument a remarkable

[1] See Bishop Kaye's Tertullian, p. 176, sqq.

CHAP. III.

one, and it is so, especially as elaborated by Tertullian, but it proceeds on a principle repeatedly advanced by him as fundamental and unassailable—*quod prius est semen sit necesse est.* He not only urges it upon the heathen, but he employs it against heretics, and confutes alike by it the corruptions of a Gnostic, and the arrogance of a Platonist. Moreover it was peculiarly an *argumentum ad hominem*, and the apologist remarks very pertinently on introducing it, *apud vos quoque religionis est instar fidem de temporibus asserere.* It was not merely that a more ancient scheme was regarded as the creditor of its modern representative, but antiquity, in the abstract, was contemplated by the Pagans with veneration and awe, and gave to any rite or relic a sacredness which no reader of the Roman Annals would be at any loss to exemplify. When Tacitus says of the rites of Palestine *antiquitate defenduntur*, he probably embodies the general opinion on the subject, which indeed has not vanished with the empires of old, nor is it confined to any age or nation: it is a sentiment providentially implanted in the human breast, appearing more or less conspicuous in each individual or people, in proportion to their loyalty and steadiness, and perhaps intended as an antagonist principle to some of the most seductive temptations with which the armoury of Satan is furnished. The reader, however, will observe that Tertullian is not attempting to shew, like biblical critics of the present day, that the books of the prophets were actually written by the persons whose names they respectively bear, as it would be of no use to combat an objection which none of his adversaries were likely to bring, he merely asserts that these writings are ancient both positively and comparatively, and entitled to appropriate respect; he shews their authority, not their truth, to which he passes (p. 65) in another argument which he

handles with peculiar eloquence (c. 20); he appeals to the *internal evidence* of the Scriptures as a proof of their divinity, and cites the evident and daily fulfilment of prophecy, as a reason for expecting the verification of what yet remained unfulfilled[1]. Tertullian is the only ancient apologist who has thus taken his stand on the Scriptures, and his position at this point of his argument is as follows: "The God whom we worship is a Being whom you involuntarily recognize. His will has been declared to man by Prophets, and is contained in a volume of demonstrable antiquity, and self evident truth." It it remarkable that Tertullian no where in this treatise *quotes* Scripture, and that he very sparingly uses scriptural expressions. Up to this point, then, (from c. 17) the defence has been little more than an apology for Judaism, as its author acknowledges (c. 21) and he proceeds to state, that, lest it should be supposed that Christianity unworthily sheltered its tenets under a recognized religion whose authority it claimed, but whose ceremonies it discarded, he was prepared to insist briefly on the characteristic tenet of the new sect, the Divinity

[1] I have inserted in my text, (p. 63) enclosed within brackets, a fragment which has been supposed by some editors to have originally formed an integral part of this chapter; but such I do not think to be the case, though I have little doubt about its being the composition of Tertullian. If the reader will refer to the page mentioned above, (p. 63), and proceed from the last words before the brackets *de temp. asserere* to the first words after the final bracket, p. 66, (which is accidentally omitted at *vestri*), he will see that the arguments both from antiquity and internal evidence are carried on completely from *omnes itaque substantias* through the remainder of that chapter and the chapter (20) next ensuing, and that in fact the inserted paragraph is nothing but an anticipation of these two pleas, which makes the original text mere tautology. I am therefore inclined to believe either that it formed part of a second edition of the Apology, which we have other reasons for concluding was published, or that it is a fragment of some treatise analogous to that *ad Nationes*, if not of that treatise itself.

CHAP. III.

of Christ (*de Christo ut Deo*). In pursuance of this object, he details the nature (*substantia*) and birth of Our Saviour with some minuteness of circumstance, (pp. 74, 75), and then shews *quomodo Christus probetur*, (p. 76). His evidence to this point, consists in a recapitulation of the general expectations of His advent prevalent amongst both Jews and Gentiles, in a brief but pregnant allusion to His miracles, and in a statement of the verification of prophecies in His person, of the preternatural darkness at the Crucifixion[1], and of the facts of the Resurrection. No mention is made of any Gospel or Evangelist, the *facts* are stated as generally known and no where questioned, and the attention is simply drawn to their character which might have been hitherto unobserved, or inferences from them which might hitherto not have been deduced. The argument from prophecy is extremely well managed, that from the miracles is only indirectly brought, though Tertullian after adverting to them adds, *ostendens se esse* λογον *Dei*, &c. (p. 77.)

In this last quoted page it is asserted that the Jews *naturally* concluded (*sequebatur uti æstimarent*) that our Lord was a magician; the meaning of the expression being that such was the only alternative left to those who saw His works, and denied His Divinity. Now this is all the notice which Tertullian here takes of the subject; but the point is so important and will be so remarkably insisted on by others who are presently to pass

[1] Some notice has been taken in my note (p. 78) of the reading *arcanis* instead of *archivis* in this passage. I may here add another argument for the latter reading. The participle *relatum* is not like our derivative, nor is it equivalent to *narratum*, but is a technical word, (see e. g. Juv. II., and *relatum in literas*, Arnob. IV. 14), and as such far more applicable to *archivis* than *arcanis*; the literal translation of *habetis relatum in archivis vestris*, is "you have it registered in your public documents."

CHAP. III.

in review before us, that I shall draw the reader's particular attention to it by a little further consideration. The most singular difference between ancient and modern scepticism, and consequently between ancient and modern apologists, is in their respective views of the miracles. The generation which witnessed these doings, and the generations which immediately succeeded, never expressed the slightest doubt as to the *fact* of their occurrence; they might explain away the prodigy by attributing it to magic, or they might invalidate its influence by setting up rival claims, but no ancient opponent of Christianity, as far as my reading and memory enable me to speak, ever thought of asserting that the historical testimony to the miracles was either insufficient or inconclusive. Even Hierocles himself, as we are expressly, though incidentally, told by Lactantius[2], acknowledged this much; and accordingly we find that contemporary apologists are occupied in proving that the miracles were not magical, and that the claims of Apollonius or Apuleius to similar powers are totally unfounded. But modern scepticism takes other ground, and declares not only that the existing evidence for the miracles is insufficient, but that no conceivable addition to it could make it effectual, and therefore *our* apologists also change the ancient position, and have now to prove *facts* which for centuries after their occurrence no one ever doubted, and the completeness of evidence which no man on any other subject would think of questioning. Grotius, I think, is the last of the apologists who devotes a chapter to refuting the charge of magic. Eye witnesses saw the works, but doubted the agency: *we* deny the facts, and dismiss the cause.

But now to return to Tertullian's proof;—half of

[2] "Idem tamen quum facta ejus (Christi) mirabilia destrueret, nec tamen negaret, voluit," &c. D. I. v. 3.

CHAP. III.

it only has been tendered, and the remaining moiety is of a character so peculiar that it is difficult to treat it in any satisfactory manner. The steps are simply these: The writer first (c. 22) asserts the existence, and describes the qualities, of spiritual beings called *dæmons;* he then endeavours (c. 23) to shew their identity with the deities of the heathen mythology, and finally affirms that a Christian can summon these spirits from the bodies of persons possessed, and compel them to admit openly their own deeds and character, and acknowledge the power and the divinity of Christ. I shall content myself here with directing the reader's attention to what appear to me the remarkable points of the case. And first, it is to be specially observed that the apologist does not use this argument incidentally, nor *ex abundanti*, but he makes it his grand proof, and evidently conceives that, though his other reasoning may possibly be got over, this plea will be quite insuperable. In summing up he makes two divisions of his defence, one of which is entirely monopolized by this argument: and this he does twice, (p. 97) *demonstravi ... non modo disputationibus nec argumentationibus, sed ipsorum etiam testimoniis quos deos creditis, ut nihil jam ad hanc caussam sit retractandum;* and (p. 149), *ostendimus totum statum nostrum, et quibus modis probare possimus sicut ostendimus, ex fide scilicet et antiquitate divinarum litterarum, item ex confessione spiritualium potestatum.* Next, I advert to the singular decision and boldness with which he challenges the trial (*edatur hic aliquis*, &c. p. 88), a trial easily made, and involving a certain final issue, as he says himself (*quid hac probatione fidelius*, p. 89), and further, particularly to the strange and undesigned testimony conveyed in the argument (p. 127), *Quis autem vos*, &c. Lastly, I would recall to the reader Tertullian's character; credulous he might be, but that

is scarcely to the point, as the appeal is to the senses of others; cowardly he was not, as this Apology proves; and how little he was likely to bend either a sentence or a fact to propitiate his judge, may be readily collected from the tone in which he tenders to the magistrate this very proposal to convict his gods of devilry and himself of folly. Of course it will be seen here that I am not speaking of the disquisitions on spiritual natures, &c. which are given in c. 22, *there* the writer is stating only *opinions*, not *facts*.

I have examined these episodical chapters the more fully, that they exclusively contain that particular kind of apologetic evidence which I am considering in this section; the remainder of the treatise is devoted to a defence of the individual or congregational practices of the Christians, and shews most clearly that main object of the composition which I have before alluded to. One or two points I wish to notice. The history of the Roman empire during the first few centuries of Christianity will secure easy credence to the narratives of those calamities which are described as then falling with overwhelming weight on the human race. With such a government, and such a succession to the throne, with legions of such a class, and national character at such a stage of decay, with civil wars almost perpetual, and barbarian irruptions gradually more threating, we need be at no loss to account for ruined cities and devastated territories, for pestilence, for famine or for blood, and the coincidence of the more awful and destructive phenomena of nature would be readily connected in the minds of the sufferers with the terrors of human infliction. But as early as the close of the second century these events had been all laid to the charge of the Christians, who were said to have provoked the ancient gods to this exhibition of their reality and wrath.

CHAP. III.

We cannot be greatly surprised at the rise of such an opinion, nor more so at its extensive prevalence, for all history teaches us how easily a suffering populace may be led to visit its miseries and its woes on the heads of any imaginary offenders; a man smarting under pain will not weigh too closely the evidence promising to detect his enemy, nor demur much at the proffered means of vengeance and relief; and thus age after age the cry was repeated which had been found so serviceable,—Tertullian in the second century, Cyprian in the third, Arnobius in the fourth, Augustine in the fifth, shew all by their successive refutation the successive occurrences of the charge, indeed the Apology of Minutius is the only one I believe which does not allude to the accusation. Tertullian indirectly adverts to the calamities of the times in c. 20, and meets the attack of the heathen directly in c. 40. His reasoning is natural and good, he points to the notorious occurrence of the like or worse misfortunes before the name of Christian was heard of, and urges the wickedness of the human race, which was always meriting such scourges. Connected with this was the claim which the Romans set up to singular and eminent piety as the foundation of their early rise and subsequent dominion, since it gave proof by analogy to the other assertion, that impiety and innovation were the causes of their declining power. To this subject Tertullian devotes a little attention (c. 25), but he handles it with more sophistry and less clearness than usual, as I have remarked in the notes.

Looking at this Apology as a whole, I cannot but consider it as incomparably excelling every similar composition of the times. Of its language I have spoken in the preceding section; its arrangement is remarkably good, the topics being so disposed that the reasoning is nearly continuous, and the propositions as they are

established are made subservient to the proofs of others: as for example,—the charge of refusing sacrifice for Cæsar is refuted in the twenty-ninth chapter, by means of the conclusions arrived at in the twelfth and twenty-second, that the gods were powerless except as dæmons, and consequently no fit subjects for worship at all. The arguments are astonishingly clear, and if contemplated *quoad homines* and *quoad causam*, can hardly fail to command our assent; while most especial care has been taken not to weaken the case by appeals to authorities which the umpires did not recognize, nor to tempt the scoffs of the ignorant by an unseasonable want of reserve. And yet notwithstanding all this, it is little matter for wonder if it failed to a great extent in its object. Without receiving the great historian's sarcastic surmise, that the apologies of the Christians probably seldom reached the circles for whose edification they were compiled, we can detect a single striking fact which in itself is sufficient to explain the difficulty. Tertullian is never content with *refuting*, he invariably *retorts*. Even on the charges of infanticide and incest, he cannot be content with clearing himself, without a supplementary demonstration of the guilt of his accusers, and he pursues the same process on the indictments of impiety and treason. It cannot be denied that these retributive sallies are always vigorous and often successful, but that would only make matters worse; an acquittal might not be easily secured even from a disinterested Roman, but after Tertullian's defence, the magistrate had no alternative between condemning the prisoner, or —taking his place. Yet the student will find few apologies which he can read without drawing comparisons very favourable to this.

The next treatise, in chronological order, is the Octavius of Minutius Felix, which will not require any lengthened

CHAP. III.

remarks. It is in the attractive form of a dialogue, between Cæcilius, a heathen of education and intelligence, and Octavius a Christian, and it contains one remarkable feature, viz., a bold exposition of the popular sentiments concerning Christianity, which is put into the opening speech of Cæcilius. It is not often that we find so plausible a statement of the *altera pars*, and Gibbon's heart seems really to have been completely won by this conciliatory candour,—*twice* he mentions *this* portion of the tract with the epithets of "fair and elegant," "elegant and circumstantial," and more than twice in various parts of his history does he quote from its favoured paragraphs. The reply of Octavius, which extends considerably beyond the length of the attack, is strictly confined to its specified subjects, a fact which must never be lost sight of if we wish to appreciate the merit of the composition. The truth is that Christianity, as a scheme, is scarcely mentioned, far less defended. Cæcilius judges of Christianity from what he has heard, and from what he saw on the surface of it, and he considers it in relation to the established rites of worship, and the existing habits of belief or disbelief. He insists particularly on the probability there is that truth is not discoverable at all, and infers the obligation thus imposed by prudence of acquiescing in things as they are, especially as under such regimen fortune and dominion had rewarded Roman piety: he ridicules the ideas of the future destruction of the world, and the resurrection of the body: and after commenting severely both on the real and the credited practices of the Christians, he concludes that they are throwing away all the tangible pleasures of this life, for the uncertain remunerations of another. It is to these statements that Octavius has to reply, which he does cleverly enough, and if some of his arguments appear borrowed, we must remember that it was scarcely

possible to avoid saying the same things on the same subject. He states very clearly the arguments for the unity of God and for the nullity of Paganism: he shews that the end of the world and the resurrection of the flesh are neither novel nor incredible tenets, and he defends the Christians successfully on the minor charges respecting their daily habits. It will be seen on a careful perusal of this treatise, that it is occupied in clearing away any antecedent objections to the *consideration* of Christianity; it shews the existence of a God, and offers proof of his unity, it demonstrates the folly of the existing religion, and removes the superficial objection to the new one, and its effect upon its readers or its audience, unless they could disprove its reasoning, must have been to convince them that there *was* a God to whom their worship was due, that they had not known him yet, and that, to say the least, there was no *a priori* evidence that the teaching of the despised Christians would not supply the knowledge.

The apologetic writings of S. Cyprian are comprised in two short tracts, one addressed *Ad Demetrianum*, and the other inscribed *de Idolorum Vanitate;* the former being an abrupt expostulation with a certain Demetrian on his shameful calumnies and persecution of the Christians. Cyprian commences with saying that he was specially urged to write by the old charge against his brethren of being the cause of all the calamities of the times, but his arguments are very different from Tertullian's. He urges that the world is near its end, that nature is effete, and that irregularities are consequently to be expected in all natural phenomena; and that moreover the heathen have deserved worse inflictions; the rest of the tract being mainly occupied with a repetition of the reasoning by which the glaring injustice of the persecutors is shewn. The tract *de Idolorum Vanitate*

CHAP. III. is divided into three chapters, treating respectively of the three heads (which are said to have been prefixed by the author) ***Quod idola Dii non sint***, ***Quod Deus unus sit***, and ***Quod per Christum salus credentibus data sit***; of these the two first propositions are proved by the same arguments and almost by the same words which occur in Minutius, and the last by an equally close transcript of Tertullian[1]. The only passage worth particular remark is the concluding paragraph, in which Cyprian states that the Christians are permitted to be tortured in order that the proofs of the truth may be more absolute (***ne esset probatio minus solida***), and he calls bodily suffering the touchstone of truth (***dolor veritatis testis***), which is indeed the argument of Paley, except that the latter confines it to the case of eye-witnesses, and to matters of fact. It is hard to pronounce upon an apologetic writing without a thorough knowledge of the individuals to whom it was addressed, or the special occasion which called it forth, and perhaps either or both of these circumstances might account for what appear imperfections in these tracts; but such reasoning as is borrowed is certainly not improved, nor are the additions to it either vigorous or ingenious; in particular, the abundant quotations from scripture addressed to an adversary who neither admitted nor appreciated the authority appealed to, are singularly mistimed, a circumstance which was remarked many ages ago[2].

We have now to proceed to a writer whose mind,

[1] At the commencement of this chapter, in the enunciation of the proposition, *Quod vero Christus sit*, I believe the words are equivalent not to *esse autem Christum*, but to *Quis sit Christus*, or *Quid vero Christus sit*, this neuter being of frequent use in this sense, (as I have remarked in the notes of this volume), and having reference to the attributes, power and substance of the Being spoken of.

[2] See Lactantius, D. I. v. 4; Hieron. Ep. 84.

CHAP. III.

powers, position, and productions are singularly different, and whose remains I think have been undeservedly neglected even by the labourers in this particular field of enquiry.

The *Disputationes* of Arnobius consist of seven books *adversus Gentes*, containing as usual a defence of Christianity and an exposure of Paganism, and embodying most of the ordinary arguments on each of these topics, but supplying at the same time some important additions and exhibiting some most remarkable views. It appears from the little information we possess concerning this writer[3], that he was a rhetorician teaching at Sikka in Africa, when his attention was first directed to Christianity; and it is related that when he applied for admission into the Church, his previous behaviour had left his character and intentions so suspicious that he wrote the treatise in question as a pledge of his sincerity. The internal evidence of the composition would certainly not run counter to such a tale; the author is clearly misinformed on many points, and uninformed on others, and displays very much such an apprehension of Christianity as might be expected in one whose knowledge was collected simply from notorious facts, or perhaps from teaching like that in the Octavius. The first two books are devoted to the defence, and the remaining five to the attack; it is of course the former division with which we shall be principally here concerned.

The commencement alleges the calumnies against the Christians, before mentioned, as the principal cause of the Apology, and a few pages are allotted to their

[3] It is not a little singular that Lactantius in his notice of preceding or contemporary apologists (D. I. v. 1.) omits all mention whatever of Arnobius, though it is generally believed that he studied rhetoric under him. Jealousy, amongst other reasons, has been assigned for this proceeding.

CHAP. III.

refutation. This is cleverly though artificially conducted, and exhibits from many points the utter absurdity of the charge. The transition is easy from this argument to a general apology for the principles of the Christian faith, as far indeed as the writer either understood or was inclined to disclose them; he defends the worship of a man born[1] (*natum hominem*) and crucified, by examples and precedents from their own religion, and shews that there can be no *prima facie* objection to Christianity even on that hypothetical ground. But he rapidly proceeds to disprove the simple humanity of Christ, and to prove his divinity[2], and his steps at this point are particularly worthy of notice. He appeals boldly and summarily to *the miracles*[3], insisting minutely and strongly on

I. *their character;* that they were never noxious, but always salutary, and of a kind befitting their author[4].

II. *their number;* which, with their variety, precluded the possibility of misapprehension[5].

III. *their openness;* that they were performed clearly, in open day, and in the sight of all[6].

IV. *the circumstances of their performance;* which was without any intermediate mechanism, and solely by a word[7].

[1] This is only for argument's sake. I. 19. "sed concedamus, interdum (i. e. interim, see notes) manum vestris opinationibus dantes, unum fuisse Christum de nobis," &c. See too c. 23.

[2] Not in the special Christian sense: he calls Christ, "interiorum potentiarum Deus, rei maximæ caussa a summo Rege ad nos missus." ib. 23.

[3] "Nulla major est comprobatio quam gestarum ab eo fides rerum." ibid. "nos quidem in illo secuti hæc sumus: opera illa magnifica; potentissimasque virtutes," II. 9. "virtutes sub oculis positæ et inaudita illa vis rerum," ib. 10.

[4] 4. "nihil nocens, aut noxium, sed opiferum, sed salutare, sed auxiliaribus plenum bonis," I. 25.

[5] II. 10.

[6] I. 32; II. 10.

[7] "Constitit Christum sine

V. *the transmission of the power to others;* which was even a stronger argument than its possession[6].

After setting forth with excessive but characteristic diffuseness these several points, he meets the opinion of those who would ascribe the works to the exercise of magic, and alludes to the assertion that Christ learnt in Egypt those powerful arts by which such prodigies were performed. He asks whether any magician of any age or country had ever done such deeds as these; whether the exploits of sorcerers were not notoriously confined to certain well-known practices; whether they were not invariably achieved with certain aids of time, place, and instruments, and whether, if their performances instead of their promises were to be considered, any one could be named whose pretensions would bear the most distant comparison with the works of Christ[7].

He next examines the claims of other *gods* to miraculous virtues, and after intimating that he could probably perplex his adversary by demanding authenticated examples of such works, he asserts that no cures were ever performed in the temples or at the shrines without the accompaniment of some medicine or regimen[8], so that the effect (if any) might always be attributed to the medium[9]. He also adds that the cures were not complete, and that the seeds of the disease still remained[10]; and that the miracles were *tentative*, for that where there was one patient healed, thousands had

ullis adminiculis rerum, sine ullius ritus observatione, vel lege, omnia illa, quæ fecit, nominis sui possibilitate fecisse," I. 25.

[6] Ib. 29.

[7] Ib. 24.

[8] "cibum aliquem jusserunt capi, aut qualitatis alicujus ebibi potionem, aut herbarum et graminum succos superponere inquietantibus caussis, ambulare, cessare, aut aliqua re, quæ officiat, abstinere." Ib. 27.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Illud audire desidero, an fecerit (deus iste) et emori valetudinum caussam, et debilium corpora ad suas remeare naturas." Ibid. Compare Paley's Evidences, Prop. II. c. 1.

CHAP. III.

wasted their time and substance around the altars of Æsculapius, without experiencing either improvement or advantage[1].

From this he proceeds to an objection familiar indeed to modern ears, but seldom urged or argued in ancient times. "You will deny the *facts*," he says,—*Sed non creditis gesta hæc!* and he replies with the best appeal to historical evidence and universal testimony which an apologist could have made. He enlarges especially and repeatedly on the open and unlimited exhibition of the miracles[2], points to their effects on eye witnesses[3], remarks that these were mighty multitudes and almost entire nations[4], who could not possibly have trusted any thing less than the irrefragable evidence of their senses, and that a refusal of their testimony involves virtually a charge of falsehood or stupidity against a whole generation, probably as sagacious, and naturally as incredulous, as ourselves[5]; he observes, too, that this history has been handed down through a body of men, who on any supposition but the truth of Christianity, must have voluntarily and gratuitously endured all temporal hardships and resigned all temporal comforts for the sake of propagating a lie[6].

[1] "Nonne alios scimus malis suos commortuos, cruciatibus alios consenuisse morborum, perniciosius alios sese habere cæpisse, post quam dies noctesque in continuis precibus et pietatis expectatione triverunt? quid ergo prodest unum aut alterum fortasse curatos ostendere?" Ibid. 28. Compare Paley again as above.

[2] I. 32; II. 9, 10.

[3] "Sed qui ea conspicati sunt fieri et sub oculis suis viderunt agi, testes optimi certissimique auctores, et crediderunt hæc ipsi, et credenda posteris nobis haud exilibus cum approbationibus tradiderunt." I. 32.

[4] "Gentes, populi, nationes, et incredulum illud genus humanum." Ibid.

[5] "Numquid dicemus illius temporis homines usque adeo fuisse vanos, mendaces, stolidos, brutos ut quæ nunquam viderant, vidisse se fingerent?" Ibid. Compare Leslie's short way with the Deists, c. I. 2. 3.

[6] "Cumque possent vobiscum et unanimiter vivere, et inoffen-

He next appeals to the existing facts of the case, and asks how the prevalence and extension of Christianity through all ranks and nations in spite of opposition and tyranny can be explained, if it is based upon falsehood[7]. This argument shews incidentally the different intentions with which this work and the Apology of Tertullian were composed; Tertullian uses it only as a dissuasive from cruelty, *he* was pleading merely for toleration; Arnobius turns it to a proof of his faith, *he* was shewing the credibility of the religion.

Towards the better consideration of the case he offers a few remarks of general import. The Christians, as is well known, were attacked for their credulity. He points to the practical influence and use of *faith* in all the ordinary transactions of life[8], and particularly enquires whether a believer in any school, or in *no* school, does not repose in some teacher or other a confidence equally implicit, and far less reasonable than that of the Christian[9]. He shews the error of any antecedent objection to Christianity, observing that there should be rather a contrary inclination, to trust the bearer of such glad tidings and such salutary words, as Christ's[10]; and adds, that if the divine promises could not logically be proved to be true, it was because the future does not admit of demonstration, but that in a case of such doubtfulness as this, it would be only consonant with sense and reason to choose the most probable alternative, and the one which offered the greatest prospect and hope of

sas ducere conjunctiones gratuita susciperent odia, et exercrabili haberentur in nomine." Ibid. Compare Paley's first proposition.

[7] Ibid. 33; II. 4. Compare Archbishop Whateley, Logic, p. 248.

[8] II. 7. Compare Newman's Parochial Sermons.

[9] Ibid.

[10] I. 38. "Vel propter id solum eum deberetis amplecti quod optabilia vobis sponderet et prospera, quod bonarum esset nuntius rerum, quod ea prædicaret quæ nullius animum læderent.'

CHAP. III.

benefit[1]; especially since, if the faith were delusive and groundless, its embrace could at worst be productive of no harm, whereas if true, its neglect would involve the loss of eternal happiness[2].

In perusing this sketch of Arnobius, the reader has probably recognized many a familiar thought, and remarked how many arguments of modern apologists have been anticipated by this obscure and neglected writer; and his own memory will doubtless supply him with many more parallelisms than I have pointed to in the notes; but even apart from this, I think the peculiar position and character of the author, invest his sentiments and his reasoning with very singular interest and value. Arnobius was not a Father of the Church, it is even questioned whether at the date of this composition he was formally admitted within its pale, he was certainly ignorant of many of its mysteries and doctrines; prophecy he makes no allusion to; there is barely evidence of his having *read* scripture, and quotations from it there are none[3]; but he was obviously a well-educated and intelligent heathen, more than usually learned and argumentative, and previously well affected to the ancient religion[4]; his liberality and candour are remarkable, he admits the existence of inexplicable mysteries, and when pressed for explanation on points such as the origin of

[1] "Nonne purior ratio est ex duobus incertis, et in ambigua expectatione pendentibus, id potius credere quod aliquas spes ferat, quam omnino quod nullas?" II. 3.

[2] "In illo enim periculi nihil est, si quod dicitur imminere cassum fiat et vacuum, in hoc damnum est maximum (id est salutis amissio) si cum tempus venerit, aperiatur non fuisse mendacium." Ibid. "Vestris non est rationibus liberum implicare vos talibus, et tam remota ab utilitate curare. Res vestra in ancipiti sita est, salus animarum vestrarum." Ibid. 47.

[3] In II. 5, there is a reference to 1 Cor. iii. 19. Sapientia enim hujus mundi, stultitia est apud Deum; but the writer introduces it with "nunquam ne *illud vulgatum* perstrinxerit aures vestras."

[4] I. 20.

evil and others, acknowledges freely his ignorance and inability[5]; he was tolerant in his ideas and an advocate for free discussion[6], and under these circumstances, and with such qualifications, he made the investigations and drew the conclusions which resulted in the work before us. If the *credere quam scire* is to be exploded as unbecoming the present stage of intellect and civilization, if the first teaching of the Church is to be the teaching her children that they ought to be taught, I cannot see a better system of evidences than thus to establish the divine origin of a scheme and thereby necessitate the acceptance of its details.

Closely following Arnobius in time, and in subject, but differing widely in his fashion of handling it comes his pupil Lactantius, an author whose writings may perhaps be less familiar than his name. His chief work, the *Divinæ Institutiones*, consists of seven books, of which the object is no less comprehensive and important than to demolish Paganism, prove Christianity, confute philosophy, establish the indissoluble connection between true wisdom and true religion, or rather, perhaps, their identity, and shew that both are to be sought and found only in the Catholic Church of Christ. The two first books expose the Pagan rites, and the third the hollowness of philosophy; the fourth contains the apologetic portion of the treatise, and the remainder completes the whole into such a system of Christian ethics as the writer could compose. As in other cases, our principal attention is directed to the apologetic chapters, which are

[5] II. 29, 41, 42. Compare too his remarks on those who died before the advent of Christ. Ibid. 49.

[6] See a curious passage, III. 5, concluding with "erroris convincite Ciceronem, temerraria et impia dicta refellitote, redarguite, reprobate. Nam intercipere scripta, et publicatam velle lectionem submergere, non est deum defendere, sed veritatis testificationem timere."

CHAP. III.

not incidentally added, but are an integral part of the work. Lactantius commences[1] with the precept that an enquirer should first of all make himself thoroughly acquainted with the Jewish history, and especially with the Prophets, and the dates of their writings, inasmuch as their testimony will be necessarily employed in the subsequent proof[2]. He then proceeds carefully through the circumstances of the Birth, Advent, Incarnation, Life, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord; and shews that all these are in exact accordance with the predictions concerning them, and this not with the scriptural prophecies only but with the Sibylline verses, and the prophecies of Hermes Trismegistus[3]. This is all which he adduces in the form of systematic evidence. He adverts to the miracles, but simply in their character as events of our Saviour's life, and insists mainly on the minute agreement of their details with the Sibylline predictions[4], from which fact also he draws his proof that they were not wrought by magic[5]. All this may appear unsatisfactory to our ideas, but many things should induce us to hesitate before we pronounce a decided opinion. The work itself is of a totally different nature from any which we have been considering. It is a kind of Book of Christiano-philosophical Institutes; it offers a system of cosmogony instead of the philosophical systems; a system of offices instead of the scholastic systems; thus withdrawing from the ancient sages their two subjects

[1] Div. Inst. IV. 5.

[2] "Quorum testimoniis uti nunc necesse est." Ibid.

[3] Ibid. 6—21.

[4] Ibid. 16.

[5] "Disce igitur, non solum idcirco a nobis Deum creditum Christum quia mirabilia fecit, sed quia vidimus in eo facta esse omnia quæ nobis annuntiata sunt vaticinio Prophetarum. Fecit mirabilia: magum putassemus, ut et vos nunc putatis et Judæi tunc putaverunt, si non illa ipsa facturum Christum Prophetæ omnes uno spiritu prædicassent." Ibid. v. 3; Compare too IV. 15.

of speculation, and making referable to true religion all the duties of life; much on the principle which has lately been defended with an ability and judgment so far superior.

There is one very remarkable feature in this case: Lactantius most clearly knew the precise nature of his task, and the best methods of achieving it; he discusses the writings of previous apologists[6], and points out with great cleverness the points in which they failed; he remarks on the difference of their objects and his, observing that it is one thing to reply to simple accusations, and another to assert a whole body of doctrine[7]; he mentions the mistake of S. Cyprian in quoting scripture to unbelievers[8], alludes to the harshness and obscurity of Tertullian[9], and acknowledges and accounts for, generally, the inefficacy of his predecessor's attempts[10]. He saw the distinction between testimony[11] and argument in evidence[12], and if he constantly, and to our ideas, unhappily, chooses and pursues the latter, we have the right, if we please, to suppose that he had good grounds for his selection. It is scarcely possible to conceive a greater contrast than he presents to Arnobius; the one declining argument, acknowledging mystery, and asserting facts; the other substituting argumentation for every thing. *Uter magis*, says the former, *videtur irrisione esse dignissimus vobis, qui sibi sci-*

[6] v. 1.

[7] "Aliud est, accusantibus respondere, quod in defensione aut in negatione sola positum est, aliud instituere quod nos facimus, in quo necesse est doctrinæ totius substantiam contineri." Ibid. 4.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid. 1.

[10] Ibid.

[11] By *testimony* though he means particularly *Scripture*, as in the passage cited above from IV. 5, and also v. 4, where he says, "non Scripturæ testimoniis, sed argumentis et ratione fuerat repellendus."

[12] "Et quanquam apud bonos judices satis habeant firmitatis vel testimonia sine argumentis, vel argumenta sine testimoniis," &c. IV. 22.

CHAP. III.

entiam nullam tenebrosæ rei alicujus assumit, an ille qui retur se ex se apertissime scire id quod humanam transsiliat notionem, et quod sit cæcis obscuritatibus involutum? The latter says, *Falsa dicentem redarguere non potest nisi qui scierit ante quid sit verum.* Arnobius declines the question of the existence of evil; Lactantius says it is necessary to the formation of its contrary, good. And his reasoning is perpetually of such a kind, which his subject gave him endless opportunities of displaying or exposing. His application of quotations could scarcely be paralleled even in that fertile school of ingenuity, and sacred and profane are all confused together. Nevertheless, as I before remarked, a rhetorician and a scholar, with so correct an appreciation of his own object, and so clear a discernment of the faults of others in following it, may not be safely or speedily condemned by us, especially when that object was so excellent and the spirit of its pursuit so good. Even the weakest point about him, his appeals to Hermes and the Sibyl, may possibly be more defensible than we imagine; he evidently was aware of the suspicions thrown on these verses[1], which he does not himself admit the justice of; they might too have been acknowledged by adversaries who denied other prophecies, and his fault is at all events no greater than would have been that of a philologist before the time of Bentley, who had proved a grammatical canon from the epistles of Phalaris.

I have here set this writer in the most favourable light in which he can be viewed, and offered the most partial explanation of his design and its prosecution. But there is another hypothesis which will as easily explain the singularities of his argument, and which will quickly suggest itself to his readers. He was a man of excessive vanity, with unhesitating confidence in his own

[1] See ad fin. IV. 15.

powers, and a profound contempt for the performances of others. Instead of excusing his weakness, like his brethren, he avows his intention of making truth more agreeable by his interesting eloquence[2], and asserts that by *his* writings not only will ancient adversaries be refuted, but future enemies deterred, and that no one after listening to *his* arguments, will be able to withhold his assent[3]. To presume that he was blinded by his conceit, would be less charitable, but perhaps not less reasonable, than to conclude he was guided by expedience.

The few years that elapsed between the treatises of Arnobius and Lactantius had sufficed to change most materially the relation in which Christianity stood to the State; the former writer sends forth from the midst of persecutions a work which calumnies drove him to publish, the latter dedicates his to imperial favour, and assumes the tone rather of one justifying an established, than pleading for a persecuted, system. But, in about half a century more, the change was complete, and Paganism appears pleading for the toleration it had so long denied. A composition of this date will complete the various specimens of apologetic writing which I promised at starting, and its brief examination will conclude a chapter which has been already extended beyond the limits proposed. In the year 384 the heathen senators

[2] "Quæ (caussa) licet possit sine eloquentia defendi, ut est a multis sæpe defensa; tamen claritate ac nitore sermonis illustranda, et quodammodo disserenda est, ut potentius in animos influat." D. I. I. præf.

[3] "Non ut contra hos scriberem, qui paucis verbis obteri poterant, sed ut omnes, qui ubique idem operis efficiunt aut effecerunt uno semel impetu profligarem .... ut et priores cum omnibus suis scriptis perverterem, et futuris omnem facultatem scribendi aut respondendi amputarem. Præbeant modo aures; efficiam profecto, ut quicunque ista cognoverit, aut suscipiat quod ante damnavit, aut, quod est proximum, deridere aliquando desistat." Ibid. v. 4.

CHAP. III.

(both then and afterwards a numerous body) deputed an eminent member of their assembly to petition the sovereign for the restoration of the Altar of Victory in the senate, and the orator accordingly, Symmachus, addressed a kind of memorial to the throne, which still remains to us under the usual title of *Relatio Symmachi*. This singular relic, ostensibly a plea for the re-erection of an altar, is in fact a prayer for the toleration of the old religion; the writer assumes very deliberately the uncertainty of *all* schemes, and avers that peculiarity of belief is neither unnatural nor unsafe[1]; on the contrary, indeed, he thinks that such a division of credulity may possibly be desirable, and that as in the multitude of counsellors there is safety, so in the variety of creeds there may be truth. *Uno itinere non potest perveniri ad tam grande secretum.* He touches on the delicate point of a government contributing to a religion not its own, and asserts that such grants may be justifiably continued, if not commenced[2]; and that since the *usefulness* of a religion is the chief proof of its divinity[3], that it is scarcely expedient to neglect those gods whose favour they had so long experienced. To this document S. Ambrose published a reply, which, though apologetic in

[1] Relat. Symm. c. 8. "Suus cuique mos, suus cuique ritus est; varios custodes urbibus et cultos mens divina distribuit."

[2] Ibid. c. 16. "Quod a principio (I would rather read *in* principio) beneficium fuit, usu atque ætate fit debitum; inanem igitur metum divino animo vestro tentat incutere, si quis asserit conscientiam vos habere præbentium, nisi detrahentium subieritis invidiam."

[3] In other words, that a man's belief in the gods depends on what he *gets* from them. As this very remarkable argument is contained in a few words I subjoin it entire. "Accedit utilitas, quæ maxime homini Deos asserit. Nam cum ratio omnis in operto sit, unde rectius quam de memoria atque *documentis rerum secundarum* cognitio venit numinum? Jam si longa ætas auctoritatem religionibus faciat, servanda est tot sæculis fides, et sequendi sunt nobis parentes, qui secuti sunt feliciter suos."

character, contains but one of the arguments of the ancient apologies[4]; Symmachus had reproduced the imperishable charge against the Christians of being the authors of all the calamities of the times, and specially of a recent famine. S. Ambrose refutes the accusation by the usual obvious facts and reasoning. The rest of his book is devoted to the discussion of his adversary's points in detail. He does not protest absolutely against the toleration of Paganism, but he vehemently dissuades the Emperor from protecting it; he urges that the Christians never applied for state-grants, but would have always been content could they have escaped persecution, and even gloried in that[5]; he contrasts the seven vestals richly salaried, magnificently lodged, and pompously honoured, with the unobtrusive celibacy of whole congregations of Christians[6], and compares generally the patience of the Christians under tortures and death, with the outcry of the Pagans under simple neglect.

After all, perhaps we have scarcely given due credit, or assigned sufficient influence, to the Christian apologists. The disparaging decisions of Lactantius may possibly be owing in a great measure to his own overweening self-conceit, or refer merely to the judgment of philosophical sophists[7]; certainly, if they are to be tested by his opinion of himself, they are of little value. We know that Christianity spread over the surface of the known

[4] Perhaps I may add that Ambrose, like Tertullian, urges the fact that the Romans were perpetually altering their religious rites, and should therefore be less outrageous at their total suppression.

[5] Ibid. c. 11.

[6] Ibid. 13. "Attollant mentis et corporis oculos, videant plebem pudoris," &c. I quote these words to remark that *pudoris* is not such a genitive as *gloriæ* in p. 65, (where see note) but is equivalent to *pudicarum*. "Let them look up, and see a whole *tribe* of virgins," &c. i. e. as opposed to the seven vestals.

[7] "*doctis hujus sæculi,*" he says, "deridentur hæc scripta."

CHAP. III.

world, and that apologies were written to promote its diffusion; we may not be able to trace their insensible operation or find recorded instances of their power, but it is at least not improbable that the steadfast endurance of a martyr whose blood was the seed of the Church, might have itself resulted from the patient and private study of such writings as these. Even their perpetual repetition argues an experience of some little previous success. At all events, the cause which they advocated was triumphant, and if we cannot discover how much of its prosperity they were mediately the authors of, that is no just or logical ground for refusing them any credit at all.

TERTULLIANI

LIBER APOLOGETICUS

ADVERSUS GENTES.

CAP. I.

You are persecuting you know not what, and what indeed such evidence as comes before you proves to be unworthy of the treatment.

I. Si non licet vobis, Romani imperii antistites[1], in aperto et edito ipso fere vertice civitatis præsidentibus ad judicandum, palam dispicere et coram examinare, quid sit liquido in caussa Christianorum; si ad[2] hanc solam speciem auctoritas vestra de justitiæ diligentia in publico aut timet aut erubescit inquirere: si denique, quod proxime accidit, domesticis judiciis nimis operata sectæ hujus infestatio obstruit[3] viam defensioni: liceat veritati vel occulta via tacitarum litterarum ad

I. [1] *Antistites.* These are termed *præsides* afterwards, c. 9, and 50. *Licet* in this sentence means little more than *lubet,* which I only mention because it has been referred to the compulsory injustice of the government, (c. 28, *imposita est vobis necessitas cogendi*), under the influence of dæmoniacal agency.

[2] *Si ad hanc,* &c. I think the construction of this rather intricate sentence is as follows: *si auct. vestr. timet aut er. inq, in publico de just. diligentia, ad hanc solam speciem. Ad* may thus mean either simply "with reference to," like *nihil ad hanc caussam retractandum,* c. 25; or it may be used after *timet,* like *expavescere ad lucem,* c. 39; *ad solitudinem,* c. 37. *pavere ad Christi mentionem,* Arnob. I. 13. *Species* in Tertullian is used for "case" or "subject," as de Orat. c. 1, *oportebat enim in hac quoque specie,* &c. but it probably signifies here *species criminis,* as de Idol. c. 1, *suam speciem tenet unumquodque delictum.* So that the sense will be, "If with regard to this charge only of all others, (i. e. Christianity), you are either ashamed or afraid to enquire publicly into the due administration of justice."

[3] *Obstruere viam.* This phrase, like *obstruere gradum,* (de Virg. Vel. c. 15; de præs. Hær. c. 15), is equivalent to *impedimento esse.*

CAP. I.

aures vestras pervenire. Nihil illa de caussa sua deprecatur, quia nec de conditione miratur. Scit se peregrinam in terris agere[4], inter extraneos facile inimicos invenire, ceterum genus, sedem, spem, gratiam, dignitatem in cœlis habere. Unum gestit[5] interdum, ne ignorata damnetur. Quid hinc deperit legibus in suo regno dominantibus, si audiatur? At hoc magis gloriabitur potestas earum, quod etiam auditam damnabunt veritatem. Ceterum inauditam si damnent, præter invidiam[6] iniquitatis etiam suspicionem merebuntur alicujus conscientiæ, nolentes audire, quod auditum damnare non possint. Hanc itaque primam caussam apud vos collocamus iniquitatis odii erga nomen Christianorum. Quam iniquitatem idem titulus[7] et onerat et revincit, qui videtur excusare, ignorantia scilicet. Quid enim iniquius, quam ut oderint homines, quod ignorant, etiamsi res meretur odium? Tunc etenim meretur, cum cognoscitur, an mereatur. Vacante[8] autem meriti notitia,

[4] Heb. XI. 13. S. Pet. I. 2. 11. The expression *agere peregrinam* will be illustrated hereafter.

[5] *Gestire* is unusually constructed with a simple accusative. —*quid hinc deperit legibus, si*— "What does the law lose in this case, if," &c. *deperire,* as Lucret. II. 296.

[6] [Quam invidiam in caussa S. Pauli agnovit ipse Festus. Acts XXV. 16, A.] *alicujus conscientiæ*— "of some privity to the crime."— *collocamus caussam apud vos*— "we lodge this accusation against you," viz., of the injustice of your hatred, &c.

[7] *Titulus,* i. q. *elogium.* A brief specification of the charge or indictment, the *proces-verbal;* both words occur frequently in Tertullian. Suetonius relates that Caligula ordered off a long file of prisoners to execution, "*nullius inspecto elogio,*" and that Domitian condemned a citizen to the beasts "*cum hoc titulo.*" *Onerat et revincit*—both aggravates and convicts—*revincit,* see ad Apul. Ap. 400.

[8] *Vacante,* i. e. *non-existente* c. 18, *ne notitia vacaret.* c. 11, *vacat ex hac parte caussa.* "If there is no knowledge of the deserts."—

unde odii justitia defenditur quæ non de eventu, sed de conscientia probanda est? Cum ergo propterea oderint homines, quia ignorant, quale sit quod oderunt, cur non liceat ejusmodi illud esse, quod non debeant odisse? Ita utrumque ex alterutro redarguimus, et ignorare illos, dum oderunt, et injuste odisse, dum ignorant. Testimonium[9] ignorantiæ est, quæ iniquitatem, dum excusat, condemnat, cum omnes, qui retro oderant, quia ignorabant, quale esset quod oderant, simul ut desinunt ignorare, cessent et odisse. Ex his fiunt Christiani, utique de comperto, et incipiunt odisse quod fuerant, et profiteri quod oderant, et sunt tanti[10], quanti et denotamur. Obsessam vociferantur civitatem, in agris[11], in castellis, in insulis Christianos; omnem sexum, ætatem, conditionem, etiam digni-

CAP. I.

Ad Nat. I. 1.

odii justitia, as de Spect. 16, "*convicia sine odii justitia, suffragia sine merito amoris.*"

[9] Constr. *Testimonium est—cum* (i. e. quod) *cessent,* &c. *retro.* in past times, formerly. This is a very frequent expression in Tertullian, who even employs the comparative *retrosior* in c. 19. Apuleius (de Deo Soc. 669) joins it with prorsus, "*naturas prorsus ac retro æviternas.*" In later Latin it is compounded with words as a prefix, but I do not think it should be so taken in c. 3. Compare Horace. Car. III. 29, 46.

[10] *Tanti—quanti,* for *tot—quot,* as usually in this author; we shall presently have *quanti transfugæ.* The censorial sense of *noto* is probably implied in *denotamur.* See below, *denotasset imprudentes.*

[11] *Agri*—the country as opposed to the town; *castella*—small villages, probably collected round some fortified post; *non solum urbibus, sed pæne vicis, castellisque singulis,* says Cæsar, (B. C. III. 32,) using a climax. The Vulgate renders κώμη by *castellum,* e. g. S. Luc. XVII. 12, *et cum ingrederetur quoddam castellum;* (in such places other versions have *vicus*); *insulæ*—the islands round the coasts as opposed to the continent. These served as places of banishment in the time of the empire. Inf. c. 12, *in insulas relegamur.* See too the *breves Gyari* of Juvenal, (I. 73.) Tacitus, (Hist. I. 2), "*plenum exsiliis mare, infecti cædibus scopuli.*"—*quasi detrimento,* i. e. *cum de. suo.*

CAP. I.

tatem transgredi ad hoc nomen quasi detrimento mœrent. Nec tamen hoc ipso modo ad æstimationem alicujus latentis boni promovent animos; non licet rectius suspicari, non libet propius experiri. Hic tantum[12] humana curiositas torpescit, amant ignorare, cum alii gaudeant cognovisse. Quanto magis hos Anacharsis denotasset imprudentes de prudentibus judicantes, quam immusicos de musicis! Malunt nescire, quia jam oderunt; adeo quod nesciunt præjudicant[13] id esse, quod, si sciant, odisse non poterant; quando si nullum odii debitum deprehendatur, optimum utique sit desinere injuste odisse; si vero de merito constet, non modo nihil odii detrahatur, sed amplius acquiratur ad perseverantiam, etiam justitiæ ipsius auctoritate. Sed non ideo, inquit[14], bonum, quia multos convertit. Quanti enim ad malum præformantur, quanti transfugæ in perversum? Quis negat? tamen quod vere malum est, ne ipsi quidem, quos rapit, defendere pro bono audent. Omne malum aut timore aut pudore natura perfudit[15]. De-

[12] *Hic tantum.* "On this subject alone the natural curiosity of man is indifferent." *cum alii*—although others, &c. Anacharsis, (Diog. Laert. I. 103,) θαυμάζειν ἔφη, πῶς παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἀγωνίζονται μὲν οἱ τεχνῖται, κρίνουσι δὲ οἱ μὴ τεχνῖται.

[13] *Præjudicare* and *præsumere* will be found in the Fathers sometimes in the simple sense of *judicare,* and at others with the usual force of *præ,* as in this passage: *præsumtio* occurs frequently in the exact sense of our word 'presumption,' v. c. 49; *nullum odii debitum*—nothing to which general hatred is due.

[14] *Inquit* sc. *aliquis.* It cannot be necessary to illustrate this ellipse to a scholar; but it should be observed that in Tertullian it is frequently that of *Dominus* or *apostolus,* and serves to introduce a quotation from scripture; e. g. de Idol. c. 13 and 14.

[15] *Perfudit.* Lucret. II. 147. '*Sol—perfundens omnia luce.*' Cyprian has the same expression.

CAP. I.

nique malefici gestiunt latere, devitant apparere, trepidant deprehensi, negant accusati, ne torti quidem facile aut semper confitentur; certe condemnati mœrent; dinumerant[16] in semetipsos, mentis malæ impetus vel fato vel astris imputant; nolunt enim suum esse, quod malum agnoscunt. Christianos vero, nihil simile[17]; neminem pudet, neminem pœnitet, nisi plane retro non fuisse. Si denotatur, gloriatur; si accusatur, non defendit; interrogatus vel ultro confitetur; damnatus gratias agit. Quid hoc mali est, quod naturam mali non habet, timorem, pudorem, tergiversationem, pœnitentiam, deplorationem? Quid hoc mali est, cujus reus gaudet? cujus accusatio votum est, et pœna felicitas? Non potes dementiam dicere, qui revinceris ignorare.

Even if we are ever so criminal, we should be placed on a level with other criminals, but in dealing with us

II. Si certum est denique nos nocentissimos esse, cur a vobis ipsis[1] aliter tractamur, quam pares nostri, id est ceteri nocentes? cum ejusdem noxæ eadem tractatio deberet intervenire. Quodcunque dicimur[2], cum alii dicuntur, et proprio ore et mer-

[16] *Dinumerant in semetipsos.* This expression is interpreted from the context, and from the parallel passage, ad Nat. I. 1. (*exprobrant quod erant in semetipsos*), to signify *animadvertunt*, or something similar, but as it does not occur elsewhere there are no other means of illustrating it. The accusative after *in* shews the idea of animadversion clearly enough, and the ellipse is probably *peccata sua.*

[17] *Nihil simile*—sc. *agitat*, or any similar expression may be supplied. Another reading is *Christianus*, which is probable. Compare in c. 2. *de nobis nihil tale. Defendit* abs. for *defendit accusationem* or *crimen.*

II. [1] *Ipsis.*—If this reading be correct, I imagine it is equivalent to *iisdem.* "Why do like criminals fare differently before the same judges?"

[2] Constr. *Quodcunque* (sc. cujuscunque criminis rei) *dicimur, cum id* (ejusdem) *alii dicuntur, utuntur, &c. Mercenaria advocatione;* Cf. Pric. ad Apul. Apol.

CAP. II.

you reverse every principle of justice and custom.

cenaria advocatione utuntur ad innocentiæ suæ commendationem. Respondendi, altercandi facultas patet, quando nec liceat indefensos et inauditos omnino damnari. Sed Christianis solis nihil permittitur loqui, quod caussam purget, quod veritatem defendat, quod judicem non faciat injustum. Sed Ad Nat. I. 2. illud solum exspectatur[3], quod odio publico necessarium est, confessio nominis, non examinatio criminis: quando si de aliquo nocente cognoscitis, non statim confesso eo nomen homicidæ, vel sacrilegi, vel incesti, vel publici hostis (ut de nostris elogiis loquar) contenti sitis ad pronuntiandum, nisi et consequentia exigatis, qualitatem facti, numerum, locum, modum, tempus, conscios, socios. De nobis nihil tale, cum æque extorqueri oporteret, quodcunque falso jactatur, quot quisque jam infanticidia degustasset[4], quot incesta contenebrasset, qui coci, qui canes affuissent. O quanta illius præsidis gloria, si eruisset aliquem, qui centum jam infantes comedisset! Atquin[5] invenimus inquisitionem quoque in nos prohibitam. Plinius enim Secundus cum provinciam regeret, damnatis quibusdam Christianis, quibusdam gradu pulsis, ipsa tamen mul-

404.—*altercandi*,—this was a special legal term, applied to the cross-questioning that took place between the parties, generally after the formal speeches. Quintil. I. O. VI. 4. I.

[3] *Expectatur*, — "All that is waited for, is,"—*elogiis*, see before, c. I. The *titulus* on the indictment of a Christian was sometimes '*hostis publicus*,' —*Contenti sitis* (eâ confess.) *ad pronuntiandum*, abs. "for giving sentence;" see at the end of this ch. *qualitatem*— the aggravating or extenuating circumstances; *numerum* — the frequency of its commission by the prisoner; *conscios*—accessories.

[4] See below, c. 8. *eruisset*— detected and dragged into light.

[5] *Atquin* — ordinarily with Tertullian for *atqui*, καιτοὶ 'and yet.'

titudine perturbatus, quid de cetero[6] ageret, consuluit Trajanum tunc imperatorem, allegans præter obstinationem non sacrificandi, nihil aliud se de sacramentis eorum comperisse, quam cœtus antelucanos ad canendum Christo ut deo et ad confœderandam disciplinam, homicidium, adulterium, fraudem, perfidiam, et cetera scelera prohibentes. Tunc Trajanus rescripsit[7], hoc genus inquirendos quidem non esse, oblatos vero puniri oportere. O sententiam necessitate confusam[8]! Negat inquirendos ut innocentes, et mandat puniendos ut nocentes. Parcit et sævit, dissimulat et animadvertit. Quid temetipsum censura circumvenis? si damnas, cur non et inquiris? si non inquiris, cur non et absolvis? Latronibus vestigandis per universas provincias militaris statio sortitur[9]; in reos majestatis et publicos hostes omnis homo miles est; ad socios, ad conscios usque inquisitio extenditur.

[6] *De cetero*—possibly *numero*, but I would rather supply *negotio* —How he should generally act in future cases. Constr. *allegans se, præter obst.*—*nihil comp.*—*quam cœtus prohib.* *Christo ut Deo*— this is clearly the correct reading, and not *et*. The importance of the variation will easily be seen: Pliny's expression — *quasi Deo*, is less liable to corruption or misrepresentation. Compare Wilson on the New Testament, c. XVIII.

[7] *rescripsit* — this expression became technical; *rescriptum*, 'an ordinance,' these documents are presently called '*principum mandata*.'—*hoc genus*, sc. *homines.*— *ejusmodi* and other phrases are constantly used by Tertullian with the like ellipse.

[8] *necessitate confusam*;—necessarily from the case itself inconsistent. *circumvenire*; v. ad c. 22.

[9] *Sortitur*. This must be taken passively. I do not remember ever to have seen it so occurring elsewhere, but the old active form *sortio* is used by Ennius, and remains in Plautus (Casin. 2, 6, 43.) compare *odiri*, c. 3. *modulari*, c. 27. *opinari*, Arnob. I. 12. The sense will be, "is appointed to the duty by lot." The robber-captain in Apuleius (Metam. VII.) speaking of one of these stations calls it '*factio militarium vexillationum*.'

CAP. II.

Solum Christianum inquiri non licet, offerri licet, quasi aliud esset actura inquisitio, quam oblationem[10]. Damnatis ergo oblatum, quem nemo voluit requisitum; qui, puto, jam non ideo meruit pœnam, quia nocens est, sed quia, non requirendus, inventus est. Itaque nec in illo ex forma malorum judicandorum agitis erga nos, quod ceteris negantibus adhibetis tormenta ad confitendum[11], solis Christianis ad negandum; cum, si malum esset, nos quidem negaremus, vos vero confiteri tormentis compelleretis. Neque[12] enim ideo putaretis non requirenda quæstionibus scelera, quia certi essetis admitti ea ex nominis confessione, qui hodie de confesso homicida, scientes homicidium quid sit, nihilominus ordinem extorquetis admissi: quo perversius, cum præsumatis de sceleribus nostris ex nominis confessione, cogitis tormentis de confessione decedere, ut negantes nomen pariter utique negemus et scelera, de quibus ex confessione nominis præsumpseratis. Sed, opinor[13], non vultis nos perire, quos pessimos creditis. Sic enim

[10] "As if the enquiry, (which is forbidden,) could have any other consequence than the production of the criminal, (which is allowed.)" *Oblatio*, bringing before a magistrate. So. c. 21, *oblatum Pontio Pilato*. Apuleius uses *magistratibus objicere*, III. 54.

[11] *Adhibetis cæteris* (dat.) you apply to. *ad confitendum*, with a view to a confession. I have elsewhere remarked on the characteristic practice of Tertullian in using verbs absolutely, but for such employment of *fateor* and its compounds he has earlier authority. See Juv. XIII. 22.

[12] Constr. *Neque enim putaretis non requirenda ideo quia certi essetis*—[vos inquam] *qui scientes —nihilominus extorquetis. ordinem admissi*—"the circumstances of the crime."

[13] *Opinor—soletis;* ironically. —*circa nos*—i. e. *erga,* "in our case." So. c. 6. *circa deos vestros.* —the use of the word is only found in late writers, but is constant in Tertullian.

soletis dicere homicidæ: nega; laniari jubere sacrilegum, si confiteri perseveraverit. Si non ita agitis circa nos nocentes, ergo nos innocentissimos judicatis, cum quasi innocentissimos non vultis in ea confessione perseverare, quam necessitate, non justitia damnandam a vobis sciatis. Vociferatur homo: Christianus sum. Quod[14] est dicit; tu vis audire, quod non est. Veritatis extorquendæ præsides, de nobis solis mendacium elaboratis audire. Hoc sum, inquit, quod quæris, an sim; quid me torques in perversum? confiteor, et torques; quid faceres, si negarem? Plane aliis negantibus non facile fidem accommodatis; nobis, si negaverimus, statim creditis. Suspecta[15] sit vobis ista perversitas, ne qua vis lateat in occulto, quæ vos adversus formam, adversus naturam judicandi, contra ipsas quoque leges ministret. Nisi enim fallor, leges malos erui jubent, non abscondi; confessos damnari præscribunt, non absolvi. Hoc senatusconsulta, hoc principum mandata definiunt, hoc imperium, cujus ministri estis. Civilis, non tyrannica dominatio vestra est. Apud tyrannos enim tormenta etiam pro pœna adhibentur; apud vos soli quæs-

[14] *Quod est dicit*—What he is he tells you.

[15] Let these unnatural features of the case lead you to suspect the existence of some secret agency. Compare c. 27, "*Ille scilicet spiritus dæmoniacæ et angelicæ paraturæ, qui noster ob divortium æmulus, et ob Dei gratiam invidus de mentibus vestris adversus nos præliatur, occulta inspiratione, modulatis et subornatis ad omnem quam in primordio exorsi sumus et judicandi perversitatem et sæviendi iniquitatem.*" *Ministret vos*—the sense is clearly *pro ministris utitur*, but I am quite unable to bring any examples in illustration; the passage quoted by Semler (de Car. Chr. XII.) is not necessarily parallel, but the use of *famulare* is similar in c. 21, '*elementa ipsa famularet.*' Gr. δουλοῦν.

CAP. II.

tioni temperantur[16]. Vestram illis servate legem usque ad confessionem; et si confessione præveniantur, vacabunt. Sententia opus est; debito pœnæ nocens expungendus est, non eximendus. Denique illum nemo gestit absolvere; non licet hoc velle; ideo nec cogitur quisquam negare. Christianum hominem omnium scelerum reum, deorum, imperatorum, legum, morum, naturæ totius inimicum existimas, et cogis[17] negare, ut absolvas, quem non poteris absolvere, nisi negaverit. Prævaricaris in leges. Vis ergo neget se nocentem, ut eum facias innocentem, et quidem invitum jam, nec de præterito reum. Unde ista perversitas? ut etiam illud non recogitetis, sponte confesso magis credendum esse, quam per vim neganti; vel ne compulsus

[16] [Temperantur, i. e. attemperantur, vel lege "apud vos solas quæstiones temperant." Sic temperare ambiguitates, c. 22; majestatem, c. 33; onus, c. 47. Prudent. π. στεφ. in Laurent. v. 347. Ad Nat. II. 3. A.] The first of these readings and explanations is the correct one. *Vestram*, &c. "Observe your own law for their application up to this point, and then, if their introduction be anticipated by voluntary confession, they will be superfluous." In the succeeding passages Tertullian argues that the magistrates are acting in direct opposition to the spirit of the law, which concludes a prisoner guilty, uses every effort to prove him so, and regards punishment as the satisfactory termination of an enquiry; whereas in this case though Christianity was reckoned an epitome of all known crimes, yet no pains were spared to make those deny their guilt who had already acknowledged it, and to secure their acquittal.

[17] *Existimas et cogis—et* for *et tamen*, as frequently. Comp. Virg. Ecl. IX. 57. Juv. VII. 124, and XIII. 91. '*putat esse Deos, et pejerat.*' *et quidem invitum*, &c.; "and this too when he declines the acquittal now, and was not guilty either originally." Constr. *illud non rec.—credendum esse—* [*neque hoc*] *ne negarit*, on the constr. of *ne*, see c. 7. '*Non ex fide*,' are to be taken in close connexion, 'untruly.' To join *non* with *negarit* is to destroy the argument, and distort the Latin.

negare, non ex fide negarit; et absolutus ibidem post tribunal de vestra rideat æmulatione, iterum Christianus. Cum igitur in omnibus nos aliter disponatis[18], quam ceteros nocentes, id unum contendendo, ut de eo nomine excludamur (excludimur enim, si facimus, quæ faciunt non Christiani), intelligere potestis non scelus aliquod in caussa esse, sed nomen, quod quædam ratio æmulæ operationis insequitur[19], hoc primum agens, ut homines nolint scire pro certo, quod se nescire pro certo sciunt. Ideo et credunt de nobis quæ non probantur, et nolunt inquiri, ne probentur non esse, quæ malunt credi esse, ut nomen illius æmulæ rationis inimicum, præsumptis, non probatis criminibus, de sua sola confessione damnetur. Ideo torquemur confitentes, et punimur perseverantes, et absolvimur negantes, quia nominis prœlium est. Denique quid de tabella recitatis illum Christianum, cur non et homicidam? Si homicida Christianus, cur non et incestus? vel quodcunque aliud nos esse creditis? In nobis solis pudet aut piget ipsis nominibus scelerum pronuntiare? Christianus si nullius criminis reus est, nomen valde infestum, si solius nominis crimen est.

[18] *disponatis*,—Since you treat us in every stage of the proceedings, &c.

[19] *Quod quædam, &c.*—"Which some system of hostile agency persecutes." The *æmula ratio* or *ratio æmulæ operationis*, is the work of Satan and his dæmons. See c. 22 and elsewhere. *Insequitur*—like *persequitur*,—c. 21. *a Judæis insequentibus multa perpessi*,—c. 50. *cur querimini, quod vos insequamur?* So *insecutores*, c. 5. *Insector* is more usually employed in this sense, but all the compounds of *sequor* admit it, and even the simple form. See c. 9. Æn. XII. 615. v. 384. *Exsecutio* is used Adv. Jud. c. 3. A little below, the genitive *rationis* depends not on *nomen* but *inimicum*.

CAP. III.

Your hatred is so blind that it gives involuntary testimony to our merits.

III. Quid? quod ita plerique clausis oculis in odium ejus impingunt, ut bonum alicui testimonium ferentes admisceant nominis exprobrationem: Bonus vir Caius Seius[1], tantum quod Christianus. Item alius: Ego miror Lucium sapientem virum repente factum Christianum. Nemo retractat[2]: Nonne ideo bonus Caius, et prudens Lucius, quia Christianus? aut ideo Christianus, quia prudens

Ad Nat. I. 4.

et bonus? Laudant quæ sciunt, vituperant quæ ignorant, et id quod sciunt, eo quod ignorant, corrumpunt; cum sit justius occulta de manifestis præjudicare, quam manifesta de occultis prædamnare. [3]Alii, quos retro ante hoc nomen vagos, viles, improbos noverant, ex ipso denotant, quo laudant; cæcitate odii in suffragium impingunt. Quæ mulier! quam lasciva, quam festiva! Qui juvenis! quam lascivus, quam amasius! Facti

III. [1] *Caius Seius,*—This was a name ordinarily employed to denote an indefinite personage. [tantum quod, i. e. excepto quod. Cic. Verr. 3, and Cic. Verr. I. 45. A.]

[2] *retractat,*—Considers, turns over in his mind, c. 11. *ut omittam hujus indignitatis retractatum.* c. 39. *de solo triclinio Christianorum retractatur.* add. c. 4.

[3] If I have rightly apprehended Tertullian in this passage, his meaning is as follows: Others stamp the previous character of their converted friends by the very list of qualities which they enumerate as having belonged to them, and of which they deplore the loss, and thus blindly add their testimony to Christianity which has accomplished the change. *Lascivus* and *festivus,* are thus taken in a bad sense (*festivi libelli* ad Nat. I. 17.) by Tertullian, though in a good one by the supposed speaker; and *facti sunt Christiani!* is the sorrowful exclamation of the convert's companion. *Ita nomen,* &c. Thus the improvement is set down to the account of the Christian profession. *paciscuntur*— compare c. 50. *cum gladio de laude pepigerunt,* though *de* marks the thing taken in barter in that case, and received in the present one. *vitam pro laude pacisci* is Virgil's expression, Æn. V.

CAP. III.

sunt Christiani. Ita nomen emendationi imputatur. Nonnulli etiam de utilitatibus suis cum odio isto paciscuntur, contenti injuria, dum ne domi habeant, quod oderunt. Uxorem jam pudicam maritus jam non zelotypus ejecit, filium jam subjectum pater retro patiens abdicavit[4], servum jam fidelem dominus olim mitis ab oculis relegavit: ut quisque hoc nomine emendatur, offendit. Tanti non est bonum, quanti est odium Christianorum. Nunc igitur, si nominis odium est, quis nominum reatus[5]? Quæ accusatio vocabulorum, nisi si aut barbarum sonat aliqua vox nominis, aut infaustum, aut maledicum, aut impudicum? Christianus vero, quantum interpretatio est[6], de unctione deducitur. Sed et cum perperam Chrestianus pro- Just. 3.
nuntiatur a vobis (nam nec nominis certa est notitia penes vos), de suavitate vel benignitate compositum est. Oditur ergo in hominibus innocuis etiam nomen innocuum. At enim secta oditur in nomine utique[7] sui auctoris. Quid novi, si aliqua disciplina de magistro cognomentum sectatoribus suis inducit? Nonne philosophi de auctoribus

[4] *Pater qui retro* (ante) *filium patiebatur non subjectum esse, jam,* &c. *abdicavit,* c. 6. *Serapidem et Isidem Coss. abdicaverunt.*—This was the technical term for such a proceeding. Quintil. VII. 4. 27. "*quales sunt* (*sc. formæ*) *in quibus abdicatur filius qui non pareat patri.*" Compare the augural use of *abdicere* in Cic. de Divin.

[5] What is there in a name to be accused, unless it be barbarous, or unlucky (*infaustum;* as *nomen abominandum,* Liv. XXVIII. 28. Lips. ad Tac. Hist. IV. 53), or scurrilous (*maledicum*), or obscene (*impudicum.*)

[6] As far as the the etymology goes.—*Chrestianus,* this was the mispronunciation of the word (see Intpp. ad Suet. Claud. 25); but even this, says Tertullian, is of good derivation and import. *Penes vos—penes* throughout this author is used in the sense of *apud,* c. 9. *penes Africam.*

[7] *Utique*—at all events for the sake of its Founder's name.

CAP. III.

suis nuncupantur Platonici, Epicurei, Pythagorici? etiam a locis conventiculorum et stationum suarum Stoici, Academici? atque medici ab Erasistrato, et grammatici ab Aristarcho, coci etiam ab Apicio? Nec tamen quemquam offendit professio nominis, cum institutione transmissa ab institutore. Plane si qui probet malam sectam et ita malum auctorem, is probabit et nomen malum dignum odio de reatu sectæ et auctoris. Ideoque ante odium nominis competebat[8] prius de auctore sectam recognoscere, vel auctorem de secta. At nunc utriusque inquisitione et agnitione neglecta nomen detinetur, nomen expugnatur, et ignotam sectam, ignotum et auctorem vox sola prædamnat, quia nominantur, non quia revincuntur.

I will now refute and retort your charges: but first let us examine the nature of the laws, whose authority you urge against us as conclusive. Laws are frequently repealed.

IV. Atque adeo quasi præfatus hæc ad suggillandam odii erga nos publici iniquitatem, jam de caussa innocentiæ consistam[1], nec tantum refutabo, quæ nobis objiciuntur, sed etiam in ipsos retorquebo, qui objiciunt; ut ex hoc quoque sciant omnes in Christianis non esse quæ in se non nesciunt esse, simul uti erubescant accusantes, non dico pessimi optimos, sed jam, ut volant, compares suos. Respondebimus ad singula, quæ in occulto admittere dicimur, quæ illos palam admittentes invenimus, in quibus scelesti, in quibus vani, in

[8] *Competebat.* "It was fitting, before hating the name, to apply the test either of the Founder's character to the sect, or that of the sect to the Founder." *Nomen detinetur*—is seized on as guilty. See ad Uxor. II. 8. *quam causam detineam?* Arnobius (I. 38) has *tenere aliquem in reatu facinoris.*

IV. [1] *Consistere* — to take up a position, for defence, c. 46. *constitimus, opinor,* &c., something like *stare pro* in earlier Latin; but the idea is contained absolutely in the verb, *de* merely expresses the thing in behalf of which the stand is made.

quibus damnandi, in quibus irridendi deputamur[2]. Sed quoniam, cum ad omnia occurrit veritas nostra, postremo legum obstruitur auctoritas adversus eam, ut aut nihil dicatur retractandum esse post leges, aut ingratis necessitas obsequii præferatur veritati[3]; de legibus prius concurram vobiscum ut cum tutoribus legum. Jam primum quam dure definitis dicendo: Non licet esse vos[4]! Et hoc sine ullo retractatu humaniore præscribitis; vim profitemini et iniquam ex arce dominationem, si ideo negatis licere, quia vultis, non quia debuit, non licere. Quodsi quia non debet, ideo non vultis licere, sine dubio id non debet licere, quod male fit, et utique hoc ipso præjudicatur licere, quod bene fit. Si bonum invenero esse, quod lex tua prohibuit, nonne ex illo præjudicio prohibere me non potest, quod si malum esset, jure prohiberet? Si[5] lex tua erravit, puto, ab homine concepta est; neque enim de cœlo ruit. Miramini hominem aut errare potuisse in lege condenda, aut resipuisse in reprobanda? Nonne et ipsius Lycurgi leges a Lacedæmoniis

CAP. IV.

[2] *Deputari.* This expression is of frequent occurrence with the meaning 'to be assigned to, reckoned amongst.' de Pœnit. c. 3. *Quorum ergo pœnitentia justa et debita videatur, id est quæ delicto deputanda sunt.* In Exh. Cast. c. 6, it retains the old sense of *puto,* as also in c. 19 of this treatise. Cf. Virg. G. II. 407.

[3] *ut aut nihil*—so that you argue, either, that after the final decision of the law against us any further consideration of our cause is useless, or, that whether you will or not, the indispensable necessity of obedience takes precedence of any respect to truth. *concurram vobiscum de*—"I will engage you on this argument." So Lactant. Ep. D. I. 52. *ratione congredi non queunt.*

[4] What a tyrannical sentence it is to pronounce at once, "Your very existence is illegal!" v. ad c. 21 and 38.—*dominationem ex arce;* i. e. *tyrannicam.*

[5] *Si* for *quodsi. homine,* i. e. *mortale, non Deo.*

CAP. IV.

emendatæ[6], tantum auctori suo doloris incusserunt, ut in secessu inedia de semetipso judicarit? Nonne et vos quotidie experimentis illuminantibus tenebras antiquitatis totam illam veterem et squalentem silvam legum novis principalium[7] rescriptorum et edictorum securibus truncatis et cæditis? Nonne vanissimas Papias leges, quæ ante liberos suscipi cogunt, quam Juliæ matrimonium contrahi, post tantæ auctoritatis senectutem heri[8] Severus constantissimus principum exclusit? Sed et judicatos retro in partes secari a creditoribus leges erant; consensu tamen publico crudelitas postea erasa est et in pudoris notam capitis pœna conversa; bonorum adhibita proscriptio suffundere maluit hominis sanguinem, quam effundere. Quot adhuc vobis

[6] *Emendatæ.* This word is emphatic; as if the sentence had been written—"Were not the laws even of Lycurgus subjected to revision? and did not this revision," &c.—*in secessu*—'in his retirement:' *inedia de semetipso judicarit;* 'put an end to his life by voluntary starvation.' *Judicare de aliquo,* to take cognizance of, and punish. In c. 14 it should probably be *fulmine judicatum,* and not *vindicatum,* the words being perpetually confused. In Juv. XIII. 226, the expression *judicet* on a similar occasion, is rather different in signification, the meaning there being 'exercises discretion in its stroke.' *inedia*—this was an ordinary method of suicide, the words '*cibo abstinuit*' describe the end of many an antient philosopher.

[7] *principalium;* like *regalium.* This is not a word of very good use; it occurs several times in the Panegyric of Pliny, and in other writers of those times, very naturally from the formal use of *princeps.* Velleius, (II. 56), speaking of Julius Cæsar, has the rather remarkable expression *non plus quinque mensium principalis quies contigit.*

[8] *Post tantæ,* &c. After an antiquity giving them such authority. *heri* may imply either that Severus had died, or was living when this was written. It simply means, 'the other day.' *Suffundere sanguinem, quam effundere:* Tertullian, as frequently, plays upon words, but *suffundi* is the ordinary expression for the blush of shame. de pudic. I. '*non suffundor errore quo carui,*' and c. 37, infra. '*suffudisset utique dominationem vestram.*

CAP. IV.

repurgandæ leges latent, quas neque annorum numerus, neque conditorum dignitas commendat, sed æquitas sola[9]? et ideo cum iniquæ recognoscuntur, merito damnantur, licet damnent. Quomodo iniquas dicimus? imo, si nomen puniunt, etiam stultas. Si vero facta, cur in nobis de solo nomine puniunt facta, quæ in aliis de admisso, non de nomine probanda definiunt? Incestus sum, cur non requirunt? infanticida, cur non extorquent? in deos, in cæsares aliquid committo, cur non audior, qui habeo, quo purger? Nulla lex vetat discuti, quod prohibet admitti; quia neque judex juste ulciscitur, nisi cognoscat admissum esse quod non licet; neque civis fideliter legi obsequitur, ignorans, quale sit, quod ulciscitur. Nulla lex sibi soli conscientiam justitiæ suæ debet, sed eis a quibus obsequium exspectat[10]. Ceterum suspecta lex est, quæ probari se non vult, improba autem, si non probata dominetur.

Against us they have been enforced only by emperors whose memory you execrate yourselves.

V. Ut de origine aliquid retractemus ejusmodi legum, vetus erat decretum, ne qui deus ab imperatore consecraretur, nisi a senatu probatus. Scit M. Æmilius de deo suo Alburno. Facit et hoc ad caussam nostram, quod apud vos de humano

[9] *Æquitas sola.* There may appear at first sight to be a contradiction in the argument here, as the laws are presently termed *iniquæ;* but the meaning of Tertullian is—"which have neither long antiquity, nor famous authors to commend them, and which therefore must be thrown for support on the sole remaining quality which ought to ensure them respect, viz., intrinsic justice, which if they possess not," &c.

[10] "There is no law which is bound to prove its justice only to itself, it owes such a demonstration also to those whose obedience it expects."

CAP. V.

arbitratu divinitas pensitatur. Nisi homini deus placuerit, deus non erit; homo jam deo propitius esse debebit. Tiberius ergo[1], cujus tempore nomen Christianum in seculum introivit, annuntiatum sibi ex Syria Palæstina, quod illic veritatem illius divinitatis revelaverat, detulit ad senatum cum prærogativa suffragii sui. Senatus, quia non ipse probaverat, respuit; Cæsar in sententia mansit, comminatus periculum accusatoribus Christianorum. Consulite commentarios vestros; illic reperietis primum Neronem in hanc sectam cum maxime Romæ orientem Cæsariano gladio ferocisse. Sed tali dedicatore[2] damnationis nostræ etiam gloriamur. Qui enim scit illum, intelligere potest, non nisi grande aliquod bonum a Nerone damnatum. Tentaverat et Domitianus, portio Neronis[3] de crudelitate; sed

V. [1] *Nisi homini*, &c. v. ad c. 29. Constr. *Tiberius—annuntiatum sibi quod revelaverat*—[id] *detulit*, &c. *nomen Christianum introivit* [sc. Christi adventu. sic. c. 40, "ante Tiberium, i. e. ante Christi adventum"—sub Claudio primum Antiochæ Christiani adpellantur hujus doctrinæ professores. v. Suid. in voc. Ναζηραῖος et Χριστιανὸς A.] *illius divinitatis;* sc. *Christi.* On the circumstances here related, see Bishop Kaye's Tertullian, p. 110, whose opinion (against Lardner and Pearson) that *ipse* must refer not to *Tiberius*, but to *Senatus*, seems to me, grammatically, to admit no kind of doubt.

[2] *Dedicare* in Tertullian means to originate, to set on foot, or establish. de Pœnit. c. 2. '*Deus in semetipso pœnitentiam dedicavit.*' de Car. Chr. '*nove nasci debebat* (sc. *Christus*) *novæ nativitatis dedicator.*' The ablative may be either absolute, or (which I prefer) made to depend on *gloriamur* with an ellipse of *in* or *super*. Lactantius brings the same charge against this emperor (de M. P. c. 2.)

[3] *Portio Neronis*—so de Pall. 4. *Subneronem*. Juvenal also taunts Domitian with this similarity of character. The genitive depends on *portio*, and *de* means *quod adtineat ad*—"A semi-Nero as regards his cruelty, but, at the suggestion of his more human feelings, he," &c. So c. 9. *Jovem patris filium de crudelitate*, but it would be an endless work to illustrate Tertullian's usage of this preposition.

qua et homo, facile cœptum repressit, restitutis etiam quos relegaverat. Tales semper nobis insecutores, injusti, impii, turpes, quos et ipsi damnare consuestis, et a quibus damnatos restituere soliti estis. Ceterum de tot exinde principibus, usque ad hodiernum, divinum humanumque sapientibus, edite aliquem debellatorem[4] Christianorum, at nos e contrario edimus protectorem, si litteræ M. Aurelii gravissimi imperatoris requirantur, quibus illam Germanicam sitim Christianorum forte militum precationibus impetrato imbri discussam contestatur. Qui sicut non palam ab ejusmodi hominibus pœnam dimovit, ita alio modo palam dispersit, adjecta etiam accusatoribus damnatione, et quidem tetriore. Quales ergo leges istæ, quas adversus nos soli exsequuntur impii, injusti, turpes, vani, dementes? quas Trajanus ex parte frustratus est vetando inquiri Christianos; quas nullus Hadrianus, quamquam curiositatum omnium explorator[5], nullus Vespasianus, quamquam Judæorum debellator, nullus Pius, nullus Verus impressit[6]. Facilius

CAP. V.

[4] *Debellatorem.* This must be understood in a restricted sense, unless it is a title given, as the old grammarians used to say, *de conatu.* Compare c. 29, '*insuper eos debellatis, qui,* &c.' Later emperors permitted such inscriptions AS NOMINE CHRISTIANO DELETO. On the subject of the ensuing assertion, see Bishop Kaye, p. 106, sqq. *Ch. forte militum*—i. e. *qui forte militabant.*

[5] [ἀκριβὴς ἦν, καὶ περίεργος καὶ πολυπράγμων. Suid. in Adr. πολυπράγμων τὰ ἀπόρρητα. Julian in Cæs. τά τε ἄλλα περιεργότατος. Dio. v. Salmas in Spart. Adr. c. 14. A.]

[6] *Impressit*—carried into execution. The meaning is obvious, but the subject from which the metaphor is taken is less so. It is explained by allusion to the military phrase *impressionem facere;* but I doubt this interpretation notwithstanding Tertullian's fondness for such expressions. Dr Ashton takes it from sealing, and interprets it *auctoritate suâ sanxit,* which I think is better,

CAP. V.

utique pessimi ab optimis quibusque, ut ab æmulis, quam a suis sociis eradicandi judicarentur.

And you are in daily practice of contemptuously infringing laws of all kinds.

VI. Nunc religiosissimi legum et paternorum institutorum[1] protectores et ultores respondeant velim de sua fide et honore et obsequio erga majorum consulta, si a nullo desciverunt, si in nullo exorbitaverunt[2], si non necessaria et aptissima quæque disciplinæ oblitteraverunt. Quonam illæ leges abierunt sumptum et ambitionem comprimentes? quæ centum æra non amplius in cœnam subscribi[3] jubebant, nec amplius quam unam inferri

and which corresponds pretty closely to a common use of *signare* in this author.

VI. [1] These titles are ironical, of course; *tutores legum* occurred in c. 4.

[2] *Exorbitaverunt* — *Orbita* is sometimes the circle of a wheel, but more frequently its track on a road. Juv. XIV. 37. *veteris trahit orbita culpæ.* Hence *exorbitare,* to go out of the way, to turn aside from the right path, like *extra oleas vagari.* So inf. c. 20, (for which expression Arnobius has *suis mundus aberravit a legibus.* I. 1.) and de Præs. Hær. c. 4. *ad hæreses non exorbitaverunt;* adv. Marc. III. 2. *exorbitavit a regula;* and again in a passage of most singular and characteristic phraseology, de Pudic. 8. The word used in the Vulgate to express precisely the same idea (Ps. LIII. 3; Rom. iii. 12) is *declinaverunt;* with which comp. Lucret. II. 216—293. In c. 21 hereafter, we have *derivantes,* with *deviantes* and *declinantes* in the varr. lect.; and in c. 2, de Hab. Mul. *devectæ de simplicitate. oblitteraverunt.* Catull. LXIII. 232. *Ambitio.* this sense of the word is explained in c. 9, de Hab. Mul. In the next chapter *quantacunque ambitione diffusa sit,* it is like Hor. Car. I. XXXVI. 20.

[3] *Subscribere alicui.* This expression very naturally, even in pretty good writers, came to signify *assentiri,* as Plin. Ep. x. 96. *Tuo desiderio subscripsi.* Through this transition Tertullian employs it in the sense of *indulgere, permittere,* v. c. 18, and de Idol. 13. *quas* (sc. luces festas) *interdum lasciviæ interdum timiditati nostræ subscribimus.* Compare de Virg. Vel. c. 10. The full phrase, however, in the idea of Tertullian was *subscribere veniam,* as appears from de Pudicit. c. 1. *ejusmodi maculis nullam subscribere veniam,* which may be found also in Cyprian. Celsus thus uses the word in a rather remarkable passage where, speaking of the system of Asclepiades in treating fevers, he says:

CAP. VI.

gallinam, et eam non saginatam[4]; quæ patricium, quod decem pondo argenti habuisset, pro magno titulo ambitionis senatu summovebant; quæ theatra stuprandis moribus orientia statim destruebant; quæ dignitatum et honestorum natalium insignia non temere nec impune usurpari sinebant? Video enim et centenarias cœnas, a centenis jam sestertiis dicendas, et in lances (parum[5] est si senatorum et non libertinorum vel adhuc flagra rumpentium) argentaria metalla producta. Video et theatra nec singula satis esse, nec nuda. Nam ne vel hieme voluptas impudica frigeret, primi Lacedæmonii odium penulæ ludis excogitaverunt. Video et inter matronas atque prostibulas nullum de habitu discrimen relictum. Circa feminas quidem etiam illa majorum instituta ceciderunt[6], quæ modestiæ, quæ sobrietati patrocinabantur, cum aurum nulla norat, præter unico digito, quem sponsus oppignerasset pronubo annulo; cum mulieres usque adeo a vino abstinerent, ut matronam ob resignatos cellæ vinariæ loculos sui[7] inedia necarint. Sub Romulo

Is enim, ulterioribus quidem diebus, cubantis (i. e. the patient's) *etiam luxuriæ subscripsit, primis vero tortoris vicem exhibuit.* (III. 4.)

[4] *Non saginatam*—not expressly fattened for the purpose. '*Nequid volucre poneretur præter unam gallinam, quæ non esset* altilis,' says Pliny; and Tertullian has used the expression, de Pœnit. c. 11, and de Spect. c. 18. See too Juv. v. 168. The word has puzzled the Delphin editor of Apuleius. *stuprandis moribus orientia*, i. e. *quæ ad m. s. orirentur*, or *statim orientia destr.*, may be taken together.

[5] *Parum est enim*—sc. *flagitii; flagra rumpentium*, i. e. *servorum* —Juv. '*hic frangit ferulas*,' and so frequently in Plautus. *Theatra nec nuda*; i. e. without an awning, as explained in the succeeding sentence;—*odium pœnulæ*; the disgrace of a covering—*ludis*; at, or for, the games.

[6] *ceciderunt.* cf. Hor. Ep. ad Pis. 70.

[7] *Sui inedia necarint*—"Her own relatives put to death by star-

CAP. VI.

vero quæ vinum attigerat, impune a Mecenio marito trucidata est. Iccirco et oscula propinquis offerre necessitas erat, ut spiritu judicarentur. Ubi est illa felicitas matrimoniorum de moribus utique prosperata, qua per annos ferme sexcentos ab urbe condita nulla repudium domus scripsit? At nunc in feminis præ auro nullum leve est membrum; præ vino nullum liberum est osculum; repudium vero jam et votum est, quasi matrimonii fructus. Etiam circa ipsos deos vestros quæ perspecte decreverant patres vestri, iidem vos obsequentissimi rescidistis. Liberum patrem cum mysteriis suis consules senatus auctoritate non modo urbe, sed
Ad Nat. I. 10. universa Italia eliminaverunt[8]. Serapidem et Isidem et Harpocratem cum suo cynocephalo, Capitolio prohibitos, id est curia deorum pulsos, Piso et Gabinius consules, non utique Christiani, eversis etiam aris eorum abdicaverunt, turpium et otiosarum superstitionum vitia cohibentes. His vos restitutis summam majestatem contulistis[9]. Ubi religio, ubi

vation;" i. e. *cognita domi caussa*, as Livy would say. The process is well known. *impune;* "without blame being attributed to him." *ut spiritu judicarentur;* "that they might be tested by the smell of their breath."—*nullum leve est membrum.* compare Pliny, H. N. XXXIII. 12. *nullum liberum est osculum;* open to any relative asking it. Perhaps we may suspect a little declamatory exaggeration here, but the writers of the Flavian and subsequent times will nearly bear out even the detail. And with the last clause of the paragraph we may compare the casual remark of Seneca, '*quando nulla nunc maritum habet, nisi ut irritet adulterum.*'

[8] *eliminaverunt.* This word is of old use and date, and may easily be met with in writers before Lucretius. But although sometimes revived, (Hor. Ep. I. 5, 25,) its authority is reckoned questionable by Quintilian, Inst. Or. III. 31. The proceedings alluded in the cases of these deities are familiar enough to all; the remarkable episode of the Bacchanalia occurs in XXXIX. 8, of Livy.

[9] *Contulistis; conferre* like our

CAP. VI.

veneratio majoribus debita a vobis? Habitu, victu, instructu, sensu, ipso denique sermone proavis renuntiastis. Laudatis semper antiquitatem, et nove de die vivitis. Per quod ostenditur, dum a bonis majorum institutis deceditis, ea vos retinere et custodire, quæ non debuistis, cum quæ debuistis non custodistis. Ipsum adhuc quod videmini fidelissime tueri a patribus traditum, in quo principaliter reos transgressionis Christianos destinatis[10], studium dico deorum colendorum, de quo maxime erravit antiquitas, licet Serapidi jam Romano aras restruxeritis, licet Baccho jam Italico furias vestras immolaveritis, suo loco ostendam proinde[11] despici et negligi et destrui a vobis adversus majorum auctoritatem. Nunc enim ad illam occultorum facinorum infamiam respondebo, ut viam mihi ad manifestiora purgem.

VII. Dicimur[1] sceleratissimi de sacramento infanticidii, et pabulo inde, et post convivium incesto, quod eversores luminum canes, lenones scilicet, tenebrarum et libidinum impiarum inverecundia procurent. Dicimur tamen semper, nec vos quod tam diu dicimur eruere curatis. Ergo aut eruite, si

To come to the horrible charges you bring against us. Have you any better evidence than rumour?

derivative of it, has frequently the sense of bestowing dignity or advantage. Cf. Juv. IX. 240, x. 265. So *collatio*.

[10] *destinatis*; *definitis, pronuntiatis*. Cic. Off. *destinare diem necis*; and I think the sense in Æn. II. 129, *me destinat aræ* is not 'dooms me,' but 'fixes upon me.'

[11] *proinde despici*—i. e. *tam, quam alia studia. proinde* occurs repeatedly for *perinde*.

VII. [1] We are called miscreants on the score of our infanticidal oath, our banquet off the victim, (*inde*) and our incestuous commerce after such banquet, which the dogs that overturn our candles, playing the part of pimps it seems, bring about through the shamelessness engendered by the darkness and unholy lusts. Still we are but *called* so, &c.

CAP. VII.

creditis, aut nolite credere, qui non eruistis. De vestra vobis dissimulatione præscribitur[2], non esse, quod nec ipsi audetis eruere. Longe aliud munus carnifici in Christianos imperatis, non ut dicant quæ faciunt, sed ut negent quod sunt. Census[3] istius disciplinæ, ut jam edidimus, a Tiberio est. Cum odio sui cœpit veritas, simul atque apparuit, inimica esse. Tot hostes ejus, quot extranei, et quidem proprii ex æmulatione Judæi, ex concussione milites, ex natura ipsi etiam domestici nostri[4]. Quotidie obsidemur, quotidie prodimur, in ipsis plurimum cœtibus et congregationibus nostris opprimimur. Quis unquam taliter vagienti infanti supervenit[5]? quis cruenta, ut invenerat, Cyclopum

[2] *Præscriptio* is an old legal term signifying an *exception* taken, in which sense it is used in the title of one of the treatises of this author. See Gesn. ad Quintil. VII. 5, 2. The verb occurs frequently in Tertullian, sometimes in the sense of 'to define formally,' and sometimes as above. Its present force is this; 'An exception is taken against you from your own inconsistency, to this effect, viz. that what you dare not drag to light, has really no existence.' The commencement of the tract Adv. Hermog. supplies an exactly similar instance both of the verb and the particle: *Solemus hæreticis, compendii gratia, de posteritate præscribere;* i. e. to take an exception at once from the lateness or novelty of their doctrine.

[3] *Census;* 'the date, the origin.' The verb and substantive are in perpetual use in this sense throughout Tertullian and the other African writers. A lost treatise of this author was de Censu Animæ. I have explained a passage in c. 12, by another late signification which this word obtained, but so constant is the occurrence of the former meaning, that I almost doubt whether it be not universal. *Cum odio sui:* from the hatred always existing towards it. So in c. 14. *plane olim, id est semper, veritas odio est.* The proverb is alluded to by Terence, '*veritas odium parit,*' and so quoted by Lactantius (Ep. D. I. c. 64.) *non odium pariet* (*ut ait Poeta*) *sed gratiam.*

[4] *proprii Judæi;* peculiarly—*ex concussione; concussio* was a legal term, implying extortion by threats or violence, which the soldiery were likely to be guilty of —*ex* would mean, from the circumstances of a practice so lucrative to them.

[5] *Taliter;* even by this sud-

et Sirenum ora judici reseravit? Quis vel in uxoribus aliqua immunda vestigia deprehendit? quis talia facinora, cum invenisset, celavit, aut vendidit ipsos trahens homines? Si semper latemus, quando proditum est, quod admittimus? imo a quibus prodi potuit? Ab ipsis enim reis non utique, cum vel ex forma omnibus mysteriis silentii fides debeatur. Samothracia et Eleusinia reticentur: quanto magis talia, quæ prodita interim etiam humanam animadversionem provocabunt, dum divina servatur[6]? Si ergo non ipsi proditores sui, sequitur ut ex- AdNat.I.7. tranei. Et unde extraneis notitia? cum semper etiam piæ initiationes arceant profanos et ab arbitris caveant, nisi si impii minus metuunt? Natura famæ omnibus nota est. Vestrum est:

CAP. VII.

Fama malum, quo non aliud velocius ullum.

Cur malum fama? quia velox? quia index? an quia plurimum mendax? quæ ne tunc quidem, quum aliquid veri affert, sine mendacii vitio est, detrahens, adjiciens, demutans de veritate. Quid? quod ea illi conditio est, ut non nisi quum men-

den surprise. *Supervenit;* came unexpectedly on. See Virg. Ecl. VI. 20. *quis talia facinora,* &c.; The argument is this: On the discovery of such enormities, the discoverer must either have taken a bribe for concealment (ad Nat. I. 7.) or he must have arrested the criminals in the act, and sold his information to a magistrate; and yet who has ever done either? If we always escape detection when was our crime discovered? *uxoribus* refers to the Christian wives of heathen husbands, whose attendance at these meetings would naturally excite suspicious observation. See the treatise ad Uxor.

[6] *dum divina servatur;* which will call down human vengeance in the present life, while the divine vengeance is being laid up for the future.

CAP. VII.

titur perseveret, et tamdiu vivit, quamdiu non probat. Siquidem ubi probavit, cessat esse, et quasi officio nuntiandi functa, rem tradit, et exinde res tenetur, res nominatur. Nec quisquam dicit verbi gratia: Hoc Romæ aiunt factum: aut: Fama est, illum provinciam sortitum; sed: Sortitus est ille provinciam, et: Hoc factum est Romæ. Fama, nomen[7] incerti, locum non habet, ubi certum est. An vero famæ credat, nisi inconsideratus? Qui est sapiens, non credit incerto. Omnium[8] est æstimare, quantacunque illa ambitione diffusa sit, quantacunque asseveratione constructa. Quod ab uno aliquando principe exorta sit, necesse est exinde in traduces linguarum et aurium serpat. Et ita modici seminis vitium cetera rumoris obscurat, ut nemo recogitet[9], ne primum illud os mendacium seminaverit, quod sæpe fit aut ingenio æmulationis, aut arbitrio suspicionis, aut non nova, sed ingenita quibusdam mentiendi voluptate. Bene autem, quod omnia tempus revelat, testibus etiam vestris proverbiis atque sententiis, ex dispositione naturæ, quæ ita ordinavit, ut nihil diu lateat, etiam quod fama non distulit[10]. Merito igitur fama tamdiu

[7] *nomen incerti;* this is in apposition to *Fama.*

[8] *omnium;* i. e. *penes quemlibet est. constructa; in altum exstructa. ab uno aliquando principe;* "from an originator who at some period of the rumour's existence (*aliquando*) stood alone and single."

[9] *recogitet ne*—i. e. *nemini hoc in mentem venit, ne forte, &c.* So c. 2. *Non recogitetis—ne negarit. quod sæpe fit;* which occurs frequently either from an envious disposition, or arbitrarily from a suspicion of the fact, or a predilection for abstract falsehood, not casual but innate. *ingenium æmulationis,* compare ad c. 15.

[10] *distulit*—has spread abroad. The proverbs alluded to occur frequently. *sententia* is used as in Juv. VIII. 125. *Quod modo proposui non est sententia.*

conscia sola est scelerum Christianorum. Hanc indicem adversus nos profertis, quæ, quod aliquando jactavit tantoque temporis spatio in opinionem corroboravit[11], usque adhuc probare non valuit.

VIII. Ut fidem naturæ[1] ipsius appellem adversus eos, qui talia credenda esse præsumunt, ecce proponimus horum facinorum mercedem; vitam æternam repromittunt. Credite interim. De hoc enim quæro, an et qui credideris, tanti habeas ad eam tali conscientia pervenire. Veni, demerge ferrum in infantem nullius inimicum, nullius reum, omnium filium[2]; vel si alterius officium est, tu modo assiste morienti homini antequam vixit; fugientem animam novam exspecta; excipe rudem sanguinem, eo panem tuum satia, vescere libenter. Interea discumbens dinumera loca, ubi mater, ubi soror; nota diligenter, ut, quum tenebræ ceciderint caninæ, non erres. Piaculum enim admiseris, nisi incestum feceris. Talia initiatus et consignatus

Are they seriously credible in persons of our habits and profession?

[11] *in opinionem corroboravit;* "has confirmed into an opinion." The sense is, That Rumour after originating the report, and at length by lapse of time fixing it as a settled opinion in men's minds, has still never been able to establish the fact by credible proof. *opinio* is thus used as something intermediate to *rumor* and *factum.*

VIII. [1] *Fidem naturæ;* By this expression is meant, I conceive, the instinctive feeling or voice of nature, which is always true and sincere, and to which Tertullian appeals, when he demands whether his persecutors can possibly believe the charges which he here exhibits in detail. *repromittunt* sc. *christiani. credite interim;* i. e. meanwhile, till we get to the end of the argument. So c. 21. *recipite interim hanc fabulam, dum ostendimus,* &c.

[2] *Ominum filium*—i. e. whose innocence and helplessness claims the paternal care of every one. *animam novam;* so Lucretius,

Nova proles—
Ludit, lacte mero mentes perculsa novellas.
II. 260.

And Minutius Felix. Oct. c. 9. '*Putas posse fieri .... ut quisquam illum rudem sanguinem novelli ac vixdum hominis* (homini antequam vixit) *cædat, fundat, exhauriat.*'

CAP. VIII.

vivis in ævum. Cupio respondeas, si tanti æternitas, aut si non, ideo nec credenda[3]. Etiamsi credideris, nego te velle, etiamsi volueris, nego te posse. Cur ergo alii possint, si vos non potestis? cur non possitis, si alii possunt? Alia nos, opinor, natura; cynopæne aut sciapodes? alii ordines dentium, alii ad incestam libidinem nervi? Qui ista credis de homine, potes et facere. Homo es et ipse, quod et Christianus. Qui non potes facere, non debes credere. Homo est enim et[4] Christianus, et quod et tu. Sed ignorantibus subjicitur et imponitur[5]. Nihil enim tale de Christianis asseverari sciebant, observandum utique sibi et omni vigilantia investi-

[3] *ideo nec credenda;* — either *æternitas quam repromittunt,* or, *facta quibus eam promereantur.*

[4] *Homo est enim et,* &c. For a Christian too is a man, and whatever you are—i. e.—whatever circumstances of organization preclude your participation in such crimes—that is he likewise. Tertullian often uses this neuter —c. 2. *quod est, dicit, tu vis audire quod non est.* and *quodcunque dicimur.* So too c. 35. *de Romanis id est;* and Arnobius frequently. e. g. II. 26. *quid esset Deus verus jam addiscerent suspicari.*

[5] *Ignorantibus* is the dative after the two impersonal verbs, of which the latter is common enough in this sense, (Juv. IV. 103.) but the former less so. It can easily be traced though, like *suppono,* through its employment for *substituo* sc. *falsa pro veris,* to its present force. Cicero uses both *subjicere* and *supponere testamenta,* for forging wills; and Pliny speaking of the cuckoo in a very amusing chapter (H. N. x. II. Ed. Franz.) has the words *caussa subjicendi pullos suos,* accounting for the intrusion of the young cuckoo into a strange nest; he afterwards calls the pullus *subditus.* So Apuleius (Apol. 491) says *aut ego subjectum* (sudariolum) *dicerem* i. e. loco mei. Compare Arnobius IV. 8. and v. 28.

The sense of the subsequent passage is as follows. It is of course ironical. But you will say that deceit and imposition is practised on these uninformed proselytes; for they never heard such charge alleged against the Christians, although such points should undeniably have been investigated. And yet it strikes me that they who wish to be initiated generally apply previously to the hierophant for information, &c.

gandum. Atquin volentibus initiari moris est, opinor, prius patrem illum sacrorum adire, quæ præparanda sint describere[6]. Tum ille: infans tibi necessarius, adhuc tener, qui nesciat mortem, qui sub cultro tuo rideat; item panis, quo sanguinis jurulentiam colligas; præterea candelabra et lucernæ, et canes aliqui et offulæ, quæ illos ad eversionem luminum extendant[7]; ante omnia cum matre et sorore tua venire debebis. Quid, si noluerint, vel nullæ fuerint? quid denique singulares Christiani[8]? Non erit, opinor, legitimus Christianus, nisi frater aut filius. Quid nunc, etsi ista omnia ignaris præparantur? Certe postea cognoscunt et sustinent et ignoscunt[9]. Timent plecti, qui si proclament, defendi merebuntur, qui etiam ultro perire malint, quam sub tali conscientia vivere. Age nunc timeant, cur etiam perseverant? Sequitur enim, ne ultra velis id te esse, quod si prius scisses, non fuisses.

IX. Hæc quo magis refutaverim, a vobis fieri

And cannot they be

[6] *adire;* I believe the construction here is *adire describere* —i. e.—*adire patrem illum ut ille tibi describat,* though it is violent enough.

[7] *extendant* — "which may make them spring forward to overturn the candles:" the dogs, according to these stories, being chained to the candlesticks, which they would thus overthrow when darting at a sop thrown to them.

[8] *Singulares Christiani;* proselytes who have no kinsfolk; something like our phrase, a 'lone woman.' The expression *Deus singularis* of Lactantius (D. I. I. 3. de M. P. 5. and elsewhere) is generally quoted here, but it is hardly an exact parallel. Compare with it *secundum singularitatis suæ præsumptionem.* adv. Marc. I. 11.

[9] "But at all events afterwards they discover the real enormities of the case, and yet they must be supposed to put up with them, and hold them venial. I suppose they dread punishment," &c. For the use of *sustineo* comp. ad. Uxor. II. 5. It is used in a similar sense (with an infinitive) by Ovid (in the Epistles), Lucan, and Juvenal, but in earlier writers *possum* is more frequent.

CAP. IX.

urged with far greater truth against yourselves?

ostendam partim in aperto, partim in occulto, per quod forsitan et de nobis credidistis. Infantes penes Africam Saturno immolabantur palam usque ad proconsulatum Tiberii, qui ipsos sacerdotes in eisdem arboribus templi sui obumbratricibus scelerum votivis crucibus exposuit, teste militia patriæ nostræ, quæ id ipsum munus illi proconsuli functa est. Sed et nunc in occulto perseverat hoc sacrum facinus. Non soli vos contemnunt Christiani, nec ullum scelus in perpetuum eradicatur, aut mores suos aliqui deus mutat. Cum propriis filiis Saturnus non pepercit, extraneis utique non parcendo perseverabat[1], quos quidem ipsi parentes sui offerebant, et libentes respondebant, et infantibus blandiebantur, ne lacrimantes immolarentur. Et tamen multum homicidio parricidium[2] differt. Major ætas apud Gallos Mercurio prosecabatur[3]. Remitto Tauricas fabulas theatris suis. Ecce in illa religiosissima urbe Æneadarum piorum est Jupiter quidam[4], quem ludis suis humano proluunt

IX. [1] *Non parcendo perseverabat;* i. e. *in non parcendo*—As he had sacrificed his own children he naturally (*utique*) continued the practice with others, especially when so liberally offered to him.

[2] [parricidium. i. e. liberorum suorum cædes. Sic. Liv. III. 50 'orabat ne se ut parricidam liberorum aversarentur, et VIII. 11. parricidium filii. A.] So Min. Fel. c. 9. *parricidium faciunt antequam pariant.* Lactantius (Ep. D. I. c. 28,) uses *parricidam* for *fratricidam; ut de duobus primogenitis hominibus alterum exstingueret* (diabolus) *alterum faceret parricidam.*

[3] By *major ætas* I should understand *senes,* see below. *prosecari* is one of that numerous class of words peculiar to sacrificial and augural details, and, like most such, of old date and usage. It here means simply, 'were sacrificed.' It occurs again c. 23 and 46.

[4] [Latiaris. Cf. Macrob. Sat. I. 10. v. Porph. π. αποχ. ap. Euseb. Ev. I. 16. Just. Mart. Ap. 2. p. 32. ed. Ox. Euseb. de laud Const. 13, 16. Tertul. Scorp. c. 5. Prudent. l. 2. Lactant. I. 21. A.] *Illa* and *piorum* are in allusion to

sanguine. Sed bestiarii, inquitis. Hoc, opinor, minus quam hominis. An hoc turpius, quod mali hominis? Certe tamen de homicidio funditur[5]. O Jovem Christianum et solum patris filium de crudelitate! Sed quoniam de infanticidio nihil interest, sacro an arbitrio[6] perpetretur (licet parricidium homicidio intersit) convertar ad populum Quot vultis ex his circumstantibus et in Christianorum sanguinem hiantibus[7], ex ipsis etiam vobis justissimis et severissimis in nos præsidibus apud conscientias pulsem, qui natos sibi liberos enecent? Siquidem et de genere necis differt; utique crudelius in aqua spiritum extorquetis, aut frigori et fami et canibus exponitis; ferro enim mori ætas quoque major optaverit. Nobis vero, homicidio semel[8] interdicto, etiam conceptum utero, dum CAP. IX.

the *supra ire Deos pietate videbis* and other like passages.

[5] *Certe tamen de homicidio*, &c. This may be either an argument put in the mouth of an adversary, or ironically suggested by the apologist. "However, at all events, the blood is only shed in a simple murder." i. e. not *parricidio;* and in the next sentence Jupiter is sarcastically complimented on this extenuation, as if he were approximating to Christian innocence, and retaining merely the abstract cruelty, and not the infanticidal taste of his father. *solum* is used adverbially. for *de*, see c. 5.

[6] *Sacro an arbitrio;* "whether from religious usage, or individual choice."

[7] *Hiare in sanguinem*—The more usual construction is *inhiare alicui;* but this is not forced.—*pulsare apud conscientiam aliquem;* to knock at a man's heart, and make an enquiry; the metaphor is taken from the common phrase *pulsare fores*, which Tertullian uses de Test. An. 1. *veritatis fores pulsarit*, though in a peculiar sense; It means there, 'to make a near approach to truth.' (Compare *scitote quia prope est in janus.*) *Siquidem et de genere*, &c. The argument is this: Murder is murder in any shape, and can have but one character, but, if the kind of death makes any difference at all, your ordinary methods of infanticide are even more barbarous than our imaginary sacrifices.

[8] *Semel;* once for all. The word is found in Lucretius in this sense, and will frequently recur in this author. *delibatur;* there

CAP. IX.

adhuc sanguis in hominem delibatur, dissolvere non licet. Homicidii festinatio est prohibere nasci; nec refert natam quis eripiat animam, an nascentem disturbet: homo est, et qui est futurus; etiam fructus omnis jam in semine est. De sanguinis pabulo et ejusmodi tragicis ferculis legite, nuncubi relatum sit, defusum brachiis sanguinem ex alterutro degustatum nationes quasdam fœderi comparasse[9]. Nescio quid et sub Catilina tale degustatum est. Aiunt et apud quosdam gentiles Scytharum defunctum quemque a suis comedi[10]. Longe excurro. Hodie istic Bellonæ sacratos sanguis de femore proscisso parmula exceptus et suis datus signat. Item illi, qui munere in arena noxiorum jugulatorum sanguinem recentem [de jugulo decurrentem exceptum] avida siti comitiali morbo medentes hauserunt[11], ubi sunt? item illi, qui de arena ferinis obsoniis cœnant, qui de apro, qui de cervo petunt[12]? Aper ille, quem cruentavit, colluctando

is doubt about this reading, and difficulty about its literal translation, but it obviously is used to express the transition of the component principles into the fœtus. *disturbare animam* means, to shake violently from its seat and destroy. *fructus omnis in semine est;* a pretty similar argument has been singularly carried out by Cicero de Divin. II. 21.

[9] *fœderi comparasse; — adhibuisse fœderi sanciendo.*

[10] *a suis comedi;* See Silius (Punic. XIII. 466. sqq.) which I quote instead of Herodotus that the reader, if he pleases, may turn to one of the most extraordinary passages (compared with Æn. VI. 373.) that can be well imagined.

[11] Constr. *qui munere* (i. e. *tempore munerum—ludis;* as in c. 6.) *avida siti hauserunt in arena sanguinem...medentes* [*ita*] *morbo, &c.* — *noxiorum jugulatorum,* of criminals who have been slain in combat. Celsus (III. 23.) mentions this empirical remedy, as does also Pliny (H.N. XXVIII. 2.) where see Harduin. The reader will hardly require to be reminded of a practice but little dissimilar which used to be witnessed at executions in this country.

[12] *de cervo petunt*—sc. *cibum;*

CAP. IX.

detersit; cervus ille in gladiatoris sanguine se jactavit. Ipsorum ursorum alvei appetuntur cruditantes adhuc de visceribus humanis. Ructatur proinde ab homine caro pasta de homine[13]. Hæc qui editis, quantum abestis a conviviis Christianorum? Minus autem et illi faciunt, qui libidine fera humanis membris inhiant, quia vivos vorant? minus humano sanguine ad spurcitiam consecrantur, quia futurum sanguinem lambunt? non edunt infantes plane, sed magis puberes. Erubescat[14] error vester Christianis, qui ne animalium quidem sanguinem in epulis esculentis habemus, qui propterea suffocatis quoque et morticinis abstinemus, ne quo sanguine contaminemur vel intra viscera sepulto. Denique inter tentamenta Christianorum botulos etiam cruore distentos admovetis, certissimi scilicet, illicitum esse penes illos, per quod exorbitare eos[15] vultis. Porro quale est, ut quos sanguinem pecoris horrere confiditis, humano inhiare credatis, nisi forte suaviorem eum experti? Quem quidem et ipsum proinde examinatorem Christianorum adhiberi ut foculum, ut acerram oportebat. Proinde enim probarentur sanguinem humanum appetendo, quemadmodum

as in the proverbial phrase '*de rogo cibum petere.*'

[13] *Caro pasta de homine;*— flesh which has fed upon man. *Hæc qui editis.* sc. *exempla.*

[14] *Erubescat Christianis* — quasi *coram Chr.* The case, however, may be the dative, or the ablative with an ellipse of *de.* Compare de Test. An. 1. *vel tibi erubescat,* and c. 11. ad extr. though it may there be the abl. abs. in c. 34. we have *de mendacio erubescere* and *de fastidio Parthorum* de Hab. Mul. c. 7. *morticinis;* such as have died a natural death, opposed to *cæsis.* The word is used in the Vulgate of meats interdicted on this ground, both in the Pentateuch and in Ezech. iv. 14. It occurs in Plautus.

[15] *Exorbitare;* see ad c. 6. I doubt whether it is transitive here or not.

CAP. IX.

sacrificium respuendo; alioquin necandi si gustassent, quemadmodum si non immolassent[16]. Et utique non deesset vobis in auditione custodiarum et damnatione sanguis humanus. Proinde incesti qui magis, quam quos ipse Jupiter docuit? Persas cum suis matribus misceri Ctesias refert. Sed et Macedones suspecti, quia quum primum Œdipum tragœdiam audissent, ridentes incesti dolorem, ἤλαυνε dicebant, εἰς τὴν μητέρα. Jam nunc recogitate, quantum liceat erroribus ad incesta miscenda, suppeditante materias passivitate[17] luxuriæ. Imprimis filios exponitis suscipiendos ab aliqua prætereunte misericordia extranea, vel adoptandos meli-

[16] *Immolassent;* abs. as de Idol. 2. '*Si quis aut incendat, aut immolet, aut polluceat.*' *in auditione custodiarum; custodia* may either mean a prison, as frequently in Cicero, or a prisoner, as in later writers; which perhaps is the better translation. *Eadem catena,* says Seneca, (Ep. v.), *et custodiam copulat et militem.* The sense of the passage will then be: 'Most assuredly your trials and condemnations of prisoners would supply you with blood enough for this purpose.' *proinde—quemadmodum* is equivalent to *pariter—atque.*

[17] *passivitas.*—i. e. *erratio promiscua.* This word is not connected with *patior,* but with *pando,* and the adverb *passim* from the same source is familiar to writers of all dates, but *passivus* and *passivitas* are not met with in authors usually studied. Apuleius speaks (Met. IX. 202) of dogs *transeuntium viatorum passivis morsibus alumnatos,* and he even uses *passive* instead of the common adverb (Met. VI. 240); *crines per colla divina passive dispersi,* as does Tertullian *passivitus,* de Pall. 3. The substantive and the adjective are of frequent occurrence in this latter writer, in the sense above mentioned. Adv. Hermog. 41. *hæc turbulentia et passivitas non est, sed moderatio et modestia,* where the antithesis shews the sense. de Cor. Mil. 8. *passivitas fallit.* Adv. Marc. I. XX. *passivus convictus,* and often elsewhere. Arnobius (IV. 17.) says of Jupiter, *concubinis, pellicibus, atque amiculis delectatus impatientiam suam spargebat passim.* It must be recollected though, that *passivus* (from *patior*) will very often be found, especially in controversial tracts. In Arnobius, if my memory serves me, its sense is exclusively this.

oribus parentibus emancipatis[18]. Alienati generis necesse est quandoque memoriam dissipari; et, semel error impegerit[19], exinde jam tradux proficiet incesti, serpente genere cum scelere. Tunc deinde quocunque in loco, domi, peregre, trans freta[20], comes est libido, cujus ubique saltus facile possunt alicubi ignaris filios pangere vel ex aliqua seminis portione; ut ita sparsum genus per commercia humana concurrat in memorias suas, neque eas cœtus incesti sanguinis agnoscat. Nos ab isto eventu diligentissima et fidelissima castitas sepsit, quantumque ab stupris et ab omni post matrimonium excessu, tantum et ab incesti casu tuti sumus. Quidam multo securiores totam vim hujus erroris virgine[21] continentia depellunt, senes pueri. Hæc in vobis esse si consideraretis, proinde in Christianis non esse perspiceretis. Iidem oculi renuntiassent utrumque[22]. Sed cæcitatis duæ species facile CAP. IX.

[18] *misericordia*—i. e. *miserante* by a common figure. *Melioribus parentibus: melior* is frequently used simply like *superior*, taking its peculiar sense from the context, and thus becomes often equivalent to *doctior* (Hor. Ep. I. 2. 68.) or *divitior*, which latter meaning it perhaps has in the present case, unless it implies that the adopted parent shews more kindness than the natural one.

[19] "When once the error has occurred." If the reading *semel* be correct, *impegerit* must be taken like *jusserit* in the celebrated line of Juvenal, III. 78, or Hor. Sat. II. 7, 32. On the ellipse, see Bentl. ad Hor. Sat. II. 6, 48, and on the subject of the passage, Minutius Felix, c. 9.

[20] *trans freta;* on the sea, as opposed to the *terra firma* either *domi* or *peregre*. *ubique saltus* appears to be used for *saltus omnivagi* or *in omnem partem facti;* like *sæpe tactus* (Lucret. I. 319.) or *semper lenitas* (Ter. Andr. I. 2. 4.)

[21] *Virgine continentia.* So Pliny speaks of *virginem terram;* see Oud. ad Apul. Met. III. extr. *senes pueri;* the general meaning of these words is clear, i. e. that some have arrived at the end of their life without losing the innocence of childhood.

[22] *renuntiassent utrumque;*

CAP. IX.

concurrunt, ut qui non vident quæ sunt, videre videantur quæ non sunt. Sic per omnia ostendam. Nunc de manifestioribus dicam.

You accuse us next of refusing to worship the gods, and sacrifice for the emperors. But first of your gods; were they not all once mortals?

X. Deos, inquitis, non colitis, et pro imperatoribus sacrificia non impenditis. Sequitur ut eadem ratione pro aliis non sacrificemus, quia[1] nec pro nobis ipsis, semel deos non colendo. Itaque sacrilegii et majestatis rei convenimur[2]. Summa hæc caussa, imo tota est, et utique digna cognosci, si non præsumptio[3] aut iniquitas judicet, altera quæ desperat, altera quæ recusat veritatem. Deos vestros colere desinimus, ex quo illos non esse cognoscimus. Hoc igitur exigere debetis, uti probemus non esse illos deos, et iccirco non colendos, quia tunc demum coli debuissent, si dii fuissent. Tunc et Christiani puniendi, si quos non colerent, quia putarent non esse, constaret illos deos esse. Sed nobis inquitis, dii sunt. Appellamus et provocamus a vobis ipsis ad conscientiam vestram, illa nos judicet, illa nos condemnet, si poterit negare omnes istos deos vestros homines fuisse. Sed et ipsa inficias si ierit, de suis antiquitatum instrumentis

would have given you both pieces of information.

X. [1] *quia;* possibly *qua,* says Dr Ashton, and it is a remark which very naturally occurs; but *quia* is used in a very singular sense sometimes, which I may elsewhere illustrate.

[2] *convenimur;* "we are convened, summoned, charged with." See c. 31. *Convenire* is a legal term, such as Tertullian often employs. It occurs frequently in the Digests, and was perhaps derived through the force of 'accosting' or 'addressing,' which *convenio* repeatedly has. So c. 28; *me conveniat Janus iratus ex qua velit fronte,* c. 35. *convenio septem collium plebem.* Ad Nat. I. 17. *vanitatis sacrilegia conveniam.*

[3] *præsumptio quæ desperat.* That prejudice which assumes the inaccessibility of truth. This was the well known Academic principle, and is that on which Cæcilius grounds his arguments against Christianity in Min. Fel. c. 1.

revincetur, de quibus eos didicit, testimonium perhibentibus[4] ad hodiernum et civitatibus, in quibus nati sunt, et regionibus, in quibus aliquid operati vestigia reliquerunt, in quibus etiam sepulti demonstrantur. Nec ego per singulos decurram, tot ac tantos, novos, veteres, barbaros, Græcos, Romanos, peregrinos, captivos, adoptivos, proprios, communes, masculos, feminas, rusticos, urbanos, nauticos, militares; otiosum est etiam titulos persequi, ut colligam in compendium, et hoc non quo cognoscatis, sed recognoscatis; certe enim oblitos agitis[5]. Ante Saturnum deus penes vos nemo est, ab illo census totius vel potioris vel notioris divinitatis. Itaque quod de origine constiterit, id de posteritate conveniet. Saturnum itaque, si quantum litteræ docent[6], neque Diodorus Græcus, aut Thallus, neque Cassius Severus, aut Cornelius Nepos, neque ullus commentator ejuscemodi antiquitatum aliud quam hominem promulgaverunt; si quantum rerum argumenta, nusquam invenio fideliora, quam apud ipsam Italiam, in qua Saturnus post multas expeditiones postque Attica hospitia consedit, exceptus a Jano, vel Jane, ut Salii volunt. Mons, quem incoluerat, Saturnius dictus;

CAP. X.

Ad Nat. II. 12.

[4] *testimonium perhibentibus.* This was the technical legal term. Apul. Met. II. 36. VOS IN HANC REM BONI QVIRITES TESTIMONIUM PERHIBETOTE. *ad hodiernum.* sc. *diem.* Cf. Oud. ad Apul. Met. II. 45.

[5] *oblitos agitis;* "you act the part of those who have forgotten it." So de præs. Hær. c. 13. *verbum ex ea natum, egisse Jesum Christum,* et infr. c. 37. *hostes exsertos agere.*

[6] *si quantum literæ docent.* If this *si* be the true reading, (and I am inclined, from its recurrence below, to believe so,) there must be an ellipse of *recogitemur,* or some such expression. Compare though the beginning of c. 12.

CAP. X.

civitas, quam depalaverat[7], Saturnia usque nunc est; tota denique Italia, post Œnotriam, Saturnia cognominabatur. Ab ipso primum tabulæ et imagine signatus numus, et inde ærario præsidet. Tamen si homo Saturnus, utique ex homine, et quia ab homine, non utique de cœlo et terra. Sed cujus parentes ignoti erant, facile fuit eorum filium[8] dici, quorum et omnes possumus videri. Quis enim non cœlum et terram matrem et patrem venerationis et honoris gratia appellet, vel ex consuetudine humana, qua ignoti vel ex inopinato apparentes[9] de cœlo supervenisse dicuntur? Proinde Saturno repentino ubique cœlitem[10] contigit dici.

[7] *depalare*—to stake off; to mark out by stakes (*pali*), or, perhaps, to fortify by a palisade. I have been unable to find this word elsewhere except in the Pastor of Hermas, where it occurs in the fifth similitude. *quumque depalasset vineam illam, et animadvertisset*, &c. and I should have given it the precise signification of our present text, but for the previous sentence, *eique assignavit vineam ut vitibus jungeret palos*, which of course explains the subsequent verb. In the other two passages in which Tertullian employs it, I cannot help thinking it is essentially the same word as in this, notwithstanding the explanations of Semler; though *depalare* signifying *manifestare*, (*palam*) is no doubt in use. Compare the expression *dispalescere* in Plautus Bacch. IV. 9, 123.

[8] Cf. Casaub. ad Pers. VI. 59.

[9] *Apparere*. This word is occasionally used with a peculiar implication of magnitude, or solemnity, or suddenness, in the object presented to view. Virgil so employs it, Æn. x. 579;

Irruit, adversaque ingens adparuit hasta.

and twice in a most magnificent passage:

Adparet domus intus, et atria longa patescunt:
Adparent Priami et veterum penetralia regum, &c.
Æn. II. 483 et 622.

Horace, Car. II. 10, 23;

Rebus angustis animosus atque
Fortis appare:

and Claudian in Eutrop. I. 390, personifying Rome—

Dimovit nebulam, juvenique adparuit ingens.

Tertullian renders ἐπιφάνεια by *apparentia*. The corresponding expressions in the Vulgate are *adventus* and *revelatio*.

[10] *Contigit*; i. e. *quasi res magna*, as in the proverb *Non cuivis*, &c. Cf. Juv. VI. 564. Hor. Ep. II. 2, 40. Lucan. I. 32.

Nam et terræ filios vulgus vocat, quorum genus incertum est. Taceo quod ita rudes tunc homines agebant, ut cujuslibet novi viri adspectu quasi divino commoverentur, quum hodie jam politi, quos ante paucos dies luctu publico mortuos sint confessi, in deos consecrent. Satis jam de Saturno, licet paucis. Etiam Jovem ostendemus tam hominem quam ex homine, et deinceps totum generis examen[11] tam mortale quam seminis sui par. CAP. X.

XI. Et quoniam, sicut illos homines fuisse non audetis negare, ita post mortem deos factos instituistis asseverare, caussas quæ hoc exegerint retractemus. Inprimis quidem necesse est concedatis esse aliquem sublimiorem deum et mancipem[1] quendam divinitatis, qui ex hominibus deos fecerit. Nam neque sibi illi potuissent sumere divinitatem, quam non habebant, nec alius præstare eam non habentibus, nisi qui proprie possidebat. Ceterum si nemo esset, qui deos faceret, frustra præsumitis deos factos auferendo factorem. Certe quidem si ipsi se facere potuissent, nunquam homines fuissent, possidentes apud se scilicet melioris conditionis potestatem. Igitur si est qui faciat deos, revertor ad caussas examinandas faci-

And such being the case, what explanation can you give of their being made gods.

Ad Nat. II. 13.

[11] *Examen.* The term is in some degree contemptuous, as de Anim. c. 23. *examen Valentini,* see Hor. Ep. I. 19, 23.

XI. [1] *Manceps divinitatis;* one who possesses divinity as his own proper and peculiar right, not derived from another, *qui proprie possidet,* as below; in the two passages where the word occurs, de Sp. 10. and de Idol. 1. it is used with allusion to its different sense of *redemptor publicus.* Arnobius I. 14. says *per quem* (i.e. mancipem hunc divinitatis) *esse et habere substantiam sui numinis majestatisque cœperunt: a quo ipsam deitatem (ut ita dicam) sortiti se esse sentiunt.*

CAP. XI.

endorum ex hominibus deorum, nec ullas invenio, nisi si ministeria et auxilia officiis divinis[2] desideravit ille magnus deus. Primo indignum est, ut alicujus opera indigeret, et quidem mortui, quum dignius ab initio deum aliquem fecisset, qui mortui erat operam desideraturus. Sed nec operæ locum video[3]. Totum enim hoc mundi corpus sive innatum et infectum[4] secundum Pythagoram, sive natum et factum secundum Platonem, semel utique in ista constructione dispositum et instructum et ordinatum cum omnis rationis gubernaculo inventum est.

[2] *Officiis divinis;* "in the discharge of his divine duties."—or it may be the dative after the two neuters. *operam desideraturus* "who was fated to experience the want of," &c. for *nisi si* v. Rup. ad Juv. VI. 250.

[3] *Sed nec operæ,* &c. If I rightly apprehend the meaning of the following passage it is this: 'Whatever theories you please to assert concerning the nativity or eternity of this universe, yet without doubt it was found by its first inhabitants to have been once for all settled at its first creation, and fully ordered and supplied with the guiding power, requisite to govern its operations and preserve its stability. That which at its origin performed all its functions, could not be imperfect. There was no department waiting for a new dynasty of gods, but the rain descended and the stars shone, and the earth gave increase as soon as the universe was in being.' Tertullian is not insisting on the immutability of the laws of nature, the *certus ordo* or *finita potestas* of Lucretius, but on the identity of natural phenomena, and the sufficiency of superintendence, from the beginning. The whole argument is urged by Arnobius (I. 15.) *Si enim temporis antiquitate mundus eos* (*i. e. Deos vestros*) *antevenit, et priusquam nati sunt, jam noverat pluvias tempestatesque natura, nullum serius nati pluendi jus habent, neque eis inserere rationibus se possunt, quas invenerunt* (compare 'inventum est' in the text) *hic agi, et majore ab auctore tractari.*

[4] *infectum,* this word is the reverse of *factum,* and is too common to mislead any one, but the student may be cautioned that in the African writers he will sometimes find the negative *in* rather unusually compounded. e. g. S. Cyprian Ep. I. *illapsa firmitas* i. e. *quæ non lapsa fuit* and Apuleius Apol. 488. *invidentia animalia* i. e. *visum non habentia.*

CAP. XI.

Imperfectum non potuit esse, quod perfecit omnia. Nihil Saturnum et Saturniam gentem exspectabat. Vani erunt homines, nisi certi sint, a primordio et pluvias de cœlo ruisse, et sidera radiasse, et lumina floruisse[5], et tonitrua mugisse et ipsum Jovem, quæ in manu ejus ponitis, fulmina timuisse; item omnem frugem ante Liberum et Cererem et Minervam, imo ante illum aliquem principem hominem de terra exuberasse, quia nihil continendo et sustinendo homini prospectum post hominem potuit inferri. Denique invenisse dicuntur[6] necessaria istæ, non instituisse. Quod autem invenitur, fuit; et quod fuit, non ejus deputabitur, qui invenit, sed ejus qui instituit. Erat enim, antequam inveniretur. Ceterum si propterea Liber deus, quod vitem demonstravit, male[7] cum Lucullo actum est, qui primus cerasa ex Ponto Italiæ promulgavit, quod non est propterea consecratus, ut novæ frugis auctor, quia inventor et ostensor. Quamobrem si ab initio et instructa et certis exercendorum officiorum suorum rationibus dispensata universitas constitit, vacat ex hac parte caussa allegendæ[8]

[5] *lumina*, i. e. *Solem ac Lunam. floruisse;* see Lucr. I. 900. IV. 452. V. 1441. *continendo homini;* this expression may be something like that frequently occurring in Cicero *continere generis humani societatem*, or, more probably equivalent to *succingendo* as explained by Arnobius (II. 21.) *quibus vita succingitur et continetur humana.* Compare VII. 2. *quis eos* (Deos) *existimet contineri alicujus alimonii genere?* and Lactantius (M. P. 5.) *Dei regentis et continentis universa.*

[6] *dicuntur*—sc. *isti dei. quod autem invenitur, fuit;* "That which is discovered, had a previous existence," &c.

[7] *male;* i. e. *maligne* 'unfairly.'

[8] *allegendæ;* this is the technical term to express a calling up to a higher rank; *allegere in Senatum* is a common phrase, and such too (an acc. after *in*) is the common construction, but it

CAP. XI.

humanitatis in divinitatem, quia quas illis stationes et potestates distribuistis, tam fuerunt ab initio, quam et fuissent, etiamsi deos istos non creassetis. Sed convertimini ad caussam aliam, respondentes collationem divinitatis meritorum remunerandorum fuisse rationem. Et hinc concedetis, opinor, illum deum deificum justitia præcellere, qui nec temere, nec indigne nec prodige tantum præmium dispensarit. Volo igitur merita recensere, an ejusmodi sint, ut illos in cœlum extulerint, et non potius in imum tartarum demerserint, quem carcerem pœnarum infernarum cum vultis[9] affirmatis. Illuc enim abstrudi solent impii quique in parentes, et in sorores incesti, et maritarum adulteri, et virginum raptores et puerorum contaminatores, et qui[10] sæviunt, et qui occidunt, et qui furantur, et qui decipiunt, et quicunque similes sunt alicujus dei vestri, quem neminem integrum a crimine aut vitio probare poteritis, nisi hominem negaveritis. Atquin ut illos homines fuisse non potestis negare[11] etiam

is used with a dative, de Resur. Carn. c. 8. *cum anima Deo allegitur, ipsa (caro) est quæ efficit ut anima allegi possit;* and by Seneca, Agam. 812.

[9] *Cum vultis.* This reading appears to me far more forcible and characteristic than the other *multis,* its meaning being: "when you are pleased to allow any future place of punishment at all." The general scepticism with regard to the ancient theology is well enough known; but if the reader should desire any specific authorities he will find them quoted by the commentators on Juv. II. 149. The criminal list following is taken from Virgil and other writers on the subject, which is alluded to in the expression *solent.*

[10] *Sævire;* 'to indulge in ungovernable passions.' Seneca treats at length of the crime *sævitia,* and in Juv. XIV. *sævire* absolutely used exactly in this manner, is opposed to *mitem animum ac mores modicis erroribus æquos.* Horace (Ep. II. 2. 134.) expresses the same idea by *insanire.*

[11] [*Ut* pro *sicut* accipere, sc. *Sicut* non potestis.. ...*etiam* istæ,

istæ notæ accedunt, quæ nec deos postea factos credi permittunt. Si enim talibus vos puniendis præsidetis, si commercium, colloquium, convictum malorum et turpium probi quique respuitis, horum autem pares deus ille majestatis suæ consortio ascivit, quid ergo damnatis, quorum collegas adoratis? Suggillatio est in cœlum vestra justitia[12]. Deos facite criminosissimos quosque, ut placeatis diis vestris. Illorum est honor consecratio coæqualium[13]. Sed ut omittam hujus indignitatis retractatum, probi et integri et boni fuerint. Quot tamen potiores viros apud inferos reliquistis? aliquem de sapientia Socratem, de justitia Aristidem, de militia Themistoclem, de sublimitate Alexandrum, de felicitate Polycratem, de copia Crœsum, de eloquentia Demosthenem. Quis ex illis diis vestris gravior et sapientior Catone, justior et militarior Scipione? quis sublimior Pompeio, felicior Sylla, copiosior[14] Crasso, eloquentior Tullio? Quanto

ut *etiam* sit post *sicut* Batavæ Latinitatis est. lege *possitis*. A.] The reading *possitis* would destroy the argument, which is syllogistic. *Non poteritis nisi negaveritis: at non potestis negare: igitur*, &c. *etiamque*; "and besides there are those charges which forbid our believing their subsequent apotheoses."

[12] *Suggillatio est*; "your administration of justice is a satire upon the inhabitants of heaven."

[13] [f. *æqualium*: nam inferioris Latinitatis est vox *coæqualis* etsi apud Columellam apparet 8. 14. sed ut opinor mendose, sic et apud Justin. 23. 4. et lib. 37. At hæc pro suspectis habet Vorstius de Lat. suspect. c. 2. et 31. nec immerito. A.] *fuerint* just below is equivalent to *putemus fuisse*.

[14] *Copiosior* more wealthy; as *copia* just above. So Cicero in Q. Cæcil. Div. xvii. *quæ mulier, ante hunc quæstorem, copiosa plane et locuples fuit.* Plautus uses *cops* Bacch. ii. 3. 117. '*Ut amantem herilem copem facerem filium.*' *militaris* is taken in the sense of 'warlike' like *militaris Daunia* in Horace, and *militia* above must mean 'warlike excellence,' though I cannot recollect its being so used elsewhere.

CAP. XII.

dignius istos deos ille assumendos expectasset, præscius utique potiorum[15]? Properavit, opinor, et cœlum semel clusit, et nunc utique melioribus apud inferos mussitantibus erubescit[16].

As to their images; you scarcely inflict more indignities upon *us*, than upon them.

XII. Cesso jam de istis, ut qui sciam me ex ipsa veritate demonstraturum quid non sint, quum ostendero quid sint. Quantum igitur de[1] diis vestris, nomina solummodo video quorundam veterum mortuorum et fabulas audio, et sacra de fabulis recognosco; quantum autem de simulacris ipsis, nihil aliud deprehendo, quam materias sorores[2] esse vasculorum instrumentorumque communium, vel ex iisdem vasculis et instrumentis quasi fatum consecratione mutantes, licentia artis transfigurante, et quidem contumeliossime et in ipso opere sacrilege, ut revera nobis maxime, qui propter deos ipsos plectimur, solatium pœnarum esse possit, quod eadem et ipsi patiuntur, ut fiant[3]. Crucibus et stipitibus imponitis Christianos: quod simulacrum non prius argilla deformat cruci et stipiti super-

[15] "With how much more propriety would he (the *deus deificus*) have waited for these men to be called up into the ranks of the gods, especially as he must have foreknown these more favourable characters."

[16] *erubescit*. See ad c. 9. I think *mussitantibus* is the abl. abs. here; its meaning is, 'murmuring with indignation;' so S. Cyprian de Mort. c. 2. *non mussitare in adversis*. *mussare* occurs in Virgil; *semel clusit*, "he finally, and once for all, closed the entrance to heaven."

XII. [1] *Quantum igitur de Diis*.......... *quantum de simulacris;* compare c. 10. *Si quantum literæ*.........*si quantum argumenta*. a little afterwards *sacra de fabulis* should be taken closely together 'rites, whose details have their origin in these myths.'

[2] *materias sorores;* "twin substances." On the argument see Min. Fel. c. 7. and compare Juv. x. 61. sqq.

[3] *ut fiant;* "in order to their creation." *crucibus et stipitibus*, &c. see this parallel carried out, c. 16. for *dedicatur* see ad c. 5.

structa? in patibulo primum corpus dei vestri dedicatur. Ungulis deraditis latera Christianorum: at in deos vestros per omnia membra validius incumbunt asciæ et runcinæ et scobinæ[4]. Cervices ponimus: ante plumbum et glutinum et gomphos sine capite sunt dii vestri. Ad bestias impellimur, certe quas Libero et Cybele et Cœlesti applicatis. Ignibus urimur: hoc et illi a prima quidem massa. In metalla damnamur: inde censentur dii vestri[5]. In insulas relegamur: solet et in insulis aliquis deus vester aut nasci aut mori. Si per hæc constat divinitas aliqua, ergo qui puniuntur consecrantur, et numina erunt dicenda supplicia. Sed plane non sentiunt has injurias et contumelias suæ fabricationis dii vestri, sicut nec obsequia. O impiæ voces, O sacrilega convicia! infrendite, inspumate[6]! iidem estis, qui Senecam aliquem pluribus et amarioribus de vestra superstitione perorantem proba- CAP. XII.

[4] *runcinæ et scobinæ;* "planes and files." The words are both recognized by Varro. Arnobius, in a very characteristic passage (vi. 16.) has *fornacibus incocta figulinis* (sc. Deum simulacra) *ex incudibus et malleis nata, tornis rasa, descobinata de limis, serris, perforaculis, asciis, secta, dolata, effossa, terebrarum excavata vertigine* (i. e. rotatione) *runcinarum levigata de planis;* where the use of *de* may be noticed.

[5] *Inde censentur Dii vestri.* From this (sc. *auro atque argento*) your gods derive their estimation. v. c. 29. *puto autem, hæ ipsæ materiæ de metallis Cæsarum veniunt,* &c. This use of *censere* will not be found, I believe, earlier than the Flavian times, but it is afterwards frequent enough. It occurs in Tacitus, Pliny, Seneca, Martial and Juvenal. I do not forget Tertullian's constant use of *census* and *censeri* for *origo* and *originem ducere,* of which Semler considers this passage too an example, but I prefer the former interpretation both here and ad Uxor. I. 6. *Romæ quidem quæ ignis illius inextinguibilis imaginem tractant......de virginitate censentur,* which Semler has overlooked in his index. Compare with the last passage c. 4. de Hab. Mul.

[6] Constr. [proinde] *infrendite, inspumate* [*hæc*] "*O impiæ voces, O! &c.*"

CAP. XII.

tis. Igitur si statuas et imagines frigidas mortuorum suorum simillimas non adoramus, quas milvi et mures et araneæ intelligunt[7], nonne laudem magis, quam pœnam, merebatur repudium agniti erroris? Possumus enim videri lædere eos, quos certi sumus omnino non esse? Quod non est, nihil ab ullo patitur, quia non est.

You treat them with every possible contumely.

XIII. Sed nobis dei sunt, inquitis. Et quomodo vos e contrario impii et sacrilegi et irreligiosi erga deos vestros deprehendimini, qui quos præsumitis esse, negligatis, quos timetis, destruatis, quos etiam vindicatis, illudatis? Recognoscitě, si mentiar. Primo quidem, cum alii alios colitis, utique quos non colitis, offenditis. Prælatio alterius sine contumelia alterius non potest procedere, quia nec electio sine reprobatione[1]. Jam ergo contemnitis, quos reprobatis, quos reprobando offendere non timetis. Nam ut supra perstrinximus, status dei cujusque in senatus æstimatione pendebat. Deus non erat, quem homo consultus noluisset et nolendo damnasset[2]. Domesticos deos, quos lares dicitis,

Ad Nat. I. 10.

[7] *intelligunt*; 'have a correct conception of,' as they shew by their contemptuous treatment of the statues. The circumstances here alluded to are frequently mentioned in ancient writers, and the images were sometimes protected by a thin plate on the top of the head.

XIII. [1] The same argument is used ad Uxor. I. 3. '*quodammodo vetantur, cum alia illis præferuntur; prælatio enim superiorum dissuasio est inferiorum.*'

[2] *Deus non erat*, &c. The word *consultus* adds great force to the sentence—'He, whom a man, when asked his pleasure about the matter, declined to deify (*noluisset* esse Deum) and by this refusal condemned, was no god at all.' *nolle* and *velle* are often used to imply a peremptory decision, resting only with the absolute will of an individual. Apuleius Met. VII. 137. *noluit Cæsar esse Hæmi collegium* (i.e. latronum): *et confestim interiit;*

CAP. XIII.

domestica potestate tractatis pignerando, venditando, demutando, aliquando in cacabulum de Saturno, aliquando in trullam de Minerva, ut quisque contritus atque contusus est, dum diu colitur, ut quisque dominus Deum sanctiorem expertus est domesticam necessitatem[3]. Publicos æque publico jure fœdatis, quos in hastario[4] vectigales habetis. Sic Capitolium, sic olitorium forum petitur[5]; sub eadem voce præconis, sub eadem hasta, sub eadem annotatione quæstoris divinitas addicta conducitur. Sed enim agri tributo onusti viliores, hominum capita stipendio censa ignobiliora; nam hæ sunt notæ captivitatis. Dii vero, qui magis tributarii, magis sancti, imo qui magis sancti, magis tributarii. Majestas quæstuaria efficitur. Circuit cauponas religio mendicans. Exigitis mercedem pro solo tem-

tantum potest etiam nutus magni principis. Min. Felix (c. 7) using the argument of the text says, *postremo est Deus, cum homo illum voluit.*

[3] "According as each god is worn and damaged by long use (Wakef. ad Lucret. I. 319) or as each master experiences a more powerful god in the shape of domestic difficulties." Some readings here omit *Deum* and others *dominus*, but I think the sarcasm is improved by the juxta-position.

[4] *Hastarium.* From the parallel chapter ad Nat. I. 10. this appears to be a kind of auction-book. The expression *de hastario emere* is used by S. Augustine Ep. XCVI. (Vol. II. p. 261. Ed. Bened.) in a passage which seems to me to have been strangely misunderstood in the Glossary of Ducange.

[5] [Petitur. i. e. conducitur a redemtore sic ad Nat. I. 10. Capitolium, Serapeum, petitur, additur, conducitur, A.] I do not remember any such use of *peto* as is here implied, and, as to the quotation from ad Nat. there is generally allowed to be a hiatus after *conducitur* which would leave room for a nominative to the two last verbs. I should explain *petitur* like *itur ad.* The *annotatio quæstoris* is the taking down by that magistrate of the biddings. *Sic Capitolium, sic olitorium,* &c. i. e. *sic—ut.* "The capitol is attended for this temple-bargaining, just as the herb-market is for other sales, the same crier, the same quæstor, serves for both."

CAP. XIII.

pli, pro aditu sacri; non licet deos nosse gratis, venales sunt. Quid omnino ad honorandos eos facitis, quod non etiam mortuis vestris conferatis? ædes proinde, aras proinde. Idem habitus et insignia in statuis. Ut ætas, ut ars, ut negotium mortui fuit, ita deus est. Quo differt ab epulo Jovis silicernium[6]? a simpulo obba? ab haruspice pollinctor? nam et haruspex mortuis apparet[7]. Sed digne imperatoribus defunctis honorem divinitatis dicatis, quibus et viventibus eum addicitis. Accepto ferent[8] dii vestri, imo gratulabuntur, quod pares eis fiant domini sui. Sed quum Larentinam publicum scortum, velim saltem Laidem aut Phrynen, inter Junones et Cereres ac Dianas adoratis; quum Simonem Magum[9] statua et inscriptione sancti dei inauguratis; quum de pædagogiis[10] aulicis nescio

[6] *Simpulum;* Vid. Rup. Exc. ad Juv. VI. 343. Intpp. ad Apul. Apol. 434. *obba;* Casaub. ad Pers. v. 148.

[7] *Apparere alicui.* This is a special sense of *apparere* signifying *ministrare, præsto esse alicui,* which is still retained in our word 'apparitor;' see c. 48. *qui judicio Dei apparet;* ad Uxor. I. 4. *præsume, oro te, nihil tibi opus esse si domino appareas.* It is used absolutely, 'are in waiting,' in Virg. Æn. XII. 850.

[8] *Accepto ferre,* to give credit for as a favour. The phrase is well known, but it is more generally *referre* in earlier Latin. Apuleius (Apol. 552) has *meo muneri acceptum ferebat.*

[9] *Simo Magus.* V. Bishop Kaye's Tertullian, p. 578, and Salmasius on the passage of Spartianus quoted below.

[10] *Pædagogiis;* The expression and the practice are both illustrated by Lipsius Exc. ad Tac. Annal. XV. B. Prudentius (Contr. Symm. I. 271) alludes by name to the *nescio quem* of the text:

Quid loquar Antinoüm cœlesti sede locatum
Illum delicias nunc Divi principis: illum
Purpureo in gremio spoliatum sorte virili.

Spartianus (Hist. Aug. I. p. 136) gives the reports current about this canonization, and two notes of Causaubon and Salmasius (in which this passage of Tertullian is included and illustrated) will shew what classical scholarship was two centuries and a half ago.

CAP. XIII.

quem synodi deum facitis: licet non nobiliores dii veteres, tamen contumeliam a vobis deputabunt, hoc et aliis licuisse, quod solis antiquitas contulit.

You insult them in your service; you ridicule them in your literature.

XIV. Nolo[1] et ritus vestros recensere; non dico, quales sitis in sacrificando, cum enecta et tabidosa et scabiosa quæque mactatis; cum de opimis et integris supervacua quæque truncatis, capitula et ungulas, quæ domi quoque pueris vel canibus destinassetis; cum de decima Herculis nec tertiam partem in aram ejus imponitis. Laudo magis sapientiam, quod de perdito aliquid eripitis[2]. Sed conversus ad litteras vestras, quibus informamini[3] ad prudentiam, et ad liberalia officia, quanta invenio ludibria? deos inter se propter Trojanos et Achivos ut gladiatorum paria congressos depugnasse; Venerem humana sagitta sauciatam, quod filium suum Ænean pæne interfectum ab eodem Diomede[4] rapere vellet; Martem tredecim mensibus in vinculis pæne consumptum; Jovem, ne eandem vim a ceteris cœlitibus experiretur, opera cujusdam monstri liberatum, et nunc flentem Sarpedonis casum, nunc fœde subantem in sororem sub commemoratione non ita delictarum jampridem amicarum. Exinde quis non poeta ex auctoritate

XIV. [1] That *nolo* and not *volo* is the correct reading, is clear, I think from the remark below, *Laudo magis*, &c. a little further down *pueris* means *servulis* as very frequently.

[2] *de perdito aliquid eripitis;* that you save something, at all events, from that which you are throwing away.

[3] *informamini.* This word is used in precisely a similar sense by Cicero pro Arch. 3. it occurs often both in this author and Arnobius.—*in prudentiam* would be rather more usual than *ad.*

[4] *ab eodem Diomede.* If this is a correct reading, the meaning is, that Venus was wounded by the same Diomed who had nearly killed her son, and from whom she was endeavouring to rescue him.

CAP. XIV.

principis sui dedecorator invenitur deorum? Hic Apollinem Admeto regi pascendis pecoribus addicit, ille Neptuni structorias operas Laomedonti locat. Est et ille de lyricis (Pindarum dico) qui Æsculapium canit avaritiæ merito, qua medicinam nocenter exercebat, fulmine vindicatum[5]. Malus Jupiter, si fulmen illius est, impius in nepotem, invidus in artificem. Hæc neque vera prodi, neque falsa confingi apud religiosissimos oportebat. Nec tragici quidem aut comici parcunt, ut non ærumnas vel errores domus alicujus dei præfentur[6]. Taceo de philosophis, Socrate contentus, qui in contumeliam deorum quercum et hircum et canem dejerabat. Sed propterea[7] damnatus est Socrates, quia deos destruebat. Plane olim, id est semper, veritas odio est. Tamen cum pœnitentia sententiæ Athenienses et criminatores Socratis postea afflixerint[8], et ima-

[5] *Vindicatum.* v. ad c. 4. Lactantius (de M. P. 1.) uses *vindicare in aliquem*, as does also Arnobius.

[6] *præfentur.* This is apparently in allusion to the custom amongst the dramatists of putting the prologue in the mouth of some god, and making him give an outline of the affairs of the family (*domus alicujus*) who were the subject of the play; as Venus in the Hippolytus and Mercury in the Amphitryo.

[7] The argument is this: 'I forbear to call the evidence of your philosophers,' says Tertullian, 'as the well known sentiments of Socrates are sufficient to make out my case and enable me to dispense with any others.' 'Yes,' replies an adversary, 'but Socrates suffered for them, which shewed the light in which we regard such opinions.' 'Why,' rejoins the apologist, 'truth generally does suffer, but, however, since the people afterwards, through repentance of the sentence pronounced, punished his accusers and honoured his memory, this reversion of the judgment restores to Socrates the validity of his evidence in my behalf.'

[8] *affligere aliquem*, sc. *solo*, is often used absolutely for *lædere, percutere;* just as *attollere* is for *opitulari* or *consolari*. So Lactantius (de M. P. 1.) *Deus jacentes et afflictos cœlesti auxilio sublevat.*

CAP. XIV.

ginem ejus auream in templo collocarint, rescissa damnatio testimonium Socrati reddidit. Sed et Diogenes nescio quid in Herculem ludit, et Romanus Cynicus Varro trecentos Joves, sive Jupiteres dicendum, sine capitibus introducit.

And you expose them to indignities in your theatres.

XV. Cetera[1] lasciviæ ingenia etiam voluptatibus vestris per deorum dedecus operantur. Dispicite Lentulorum et Hostiliorum venustates, utrum mimos an deos vestros in jocis et strophis[2] rideatis: mœchum Anubim, et masculum Lunam, et Dianam flagellatam, et Jovis mortui testamentum recitatum, et tres Hercules famelicos irrisos. Sed et histrionum litteræ omnem fœditatem eorum designant. Luget Sol filium jactatum de cœlo lætantibus vobis, et Cybele pastorem suspirat[3] fastidiosum, non erubescentibus vobis. Et sustinetis Jovis elogia cantari, et Junonem, Venerem, Minervam a pastore judicari. Quid, quod imago dei vestri ignominiosum caput et famosum vestit? quod corpus

XV. [1] "The other ingenuities of luxury work out your pleasure by means of the ignominy of the gods:" *lasciviæ ingenia* like *ingenia decoris*. de Hab. Mul. c. 2. Compare Arnobius IV. 2. *ingeniorum lascivire luxu* and VI. 13. *in deorum corporibus lasciviæ artificum ludunt.* The same writer paraphrases Tertullian thus: *nonne lenocinia voluptatum ex contumeliis attrahit divinis.*

[2] *Strophis. Quasi mimum Philistionis vel Lentuli ac Marulli stropham eleganti sermone confictam.* Hieron. adv. Ruf. II. *nec fabulæ, sed veritates, nec strophæ sed simplicitates.* de Spect. 29. *dispicite* means *examinate* as in c. 1.

[3] *Suspirat pastorem.* As Juv. XI. 152.

Suspirat longo non visam tempore matrem.

though the expression is earlier than his date, and of fair repute. See Heyne Obss. in Tibull. I. 6, 35. It occurs de Hab. Mul. c. 2. and de Cult. Fæm. c. 6. Arnobius (IV. 20) uses *suspirare in aliquid*, and Catullus (LXIV. 98) who is followed by Ovid (Fast. I. 417) *suspirare in aliquo.* In a similar manner *ardere in* is followed either by an abl. or acc. Cyprian speaks

CAP. XV. impurum et ad istam artem effeminatione[4] productum Minervam aliquam vel Herculem repræsentat? Nonne violatur majestas et divinitas constupratur plaudentibus vobis? Plane religiosiores estis in cavea, ubi super sanguinem humanum, super inquinamenta pœnarum proinde saltant dii vestri, argumenta[5] et historias noxiis ministrantes, nisi quod et ipsos deos vestros sæpe noxii induunt[6]. Vidimus aliquando castratum Atyn, illum deum ex Pessinunte, et, qui vivus ardebat, Herculem induerat. Risimus et inter ludicras meridianorum crudelitates[7] Mercurium mortuos cauterio examinantem. Vidimus et Jovis fratrem gladiatorum cadavera cum malleo deducentem. Singula ista quæque adhuc investigare quis possit? Si honorem inquietant divinitatis, si majestatis vestigia obsoletant[8], de

of Jupiter *in terrenos amores ardentem.*

[4] *Effeminatione.* The verb *effemino* is used by Cicero, Cæsar, and other good writers, but I cannot bring any earlier example of this noun. In later times it had generally the forcible meaning of *castratio.* Compare Lactantius Ep. D. I. 8. *adolescentem, ademtis genitalibus, effeminavit.* Minerva is probably quoted with Hercules in this passage, on account of her masculine and heroic character, which of course makes this impersonation more monstrous.

[5] *Argumenta.* I conceive this word here to mean literally 'arguments,' and not to imply *mendacia* or *vanitates* as very frequently indeed in late writers.

[6] *induunt;* 'personate,' the expression being taken from the mask which determined the character. In the following sentence I think the sense is this: "It is not uncommon to see these representatives of deities undergoing in reality as a punishment for their crimes the sufferings attributed by fable to their respective gods, whose characters they have respectively assumed."

[7] *Meridianorum crudelitates;* v. Lips. Satur. II. 15. Seneca, Ep. VII. says, *mane leonibus et ursis homines, meridie spectatoribus suis objiciuntur.* The whole of this short epistle might be very profitably perused by any one who suspects Tertullian's tract *de spectaculis* of exaggeration, or his opinions of bigotry.

[8] *Obsoletant.* This word is almost peculiar to this author, but S. Augustine uses *obsolefacere. de*

CAP. XV.

contemtu utique censentur, tam eorum qui ejusmodi factitant, quam eorum quibus factitant. Sed ludicra ista sunt. Ceterum si adjiciam, quæ non minus conscientiæ omnium recognoscent, in templis adulteria componi, inter aras lenocinia tractari, in ipsis plerumque æditorum et sacerdotum tabernaculis, sub iisdem vittis et apicibus et purpuris, thure flagrante libidinem expungi: nescio, plusne de vobis dii vestri, quam de Christianis querantur. Certe sacrilegi de vestris semper apprehenduntur[9]. Christiani enim templa nec interdiu norunt; spoliarent forsitan ea et ipsi, si et ipsi ea adorarent. Quid ergo colunt, qui talia non colunt? Jam quidem intelligi subjacet[10] veritatis esse cultores, qui mendacii non sint: nec errare amplius in eo, in quo errasse se recognoscendo cessaverint. Hoc prius capite, et omnem hinc sacramenti nostri ordinem haurite, repercussis ante tamen opinionibus falsis.

XVI. Nam, ut quidam, somniastis caput asininum esse deum nostrum. Hanc Cornelius Tacitus suspicionem ejusmodi inseruit. Is enim in quinta historiarum suarum bellum Judaicum[1] exorsus ab

But in fact you really commit yourselves the idolatrous absurdities of

contemtu censentur. i. e. contemtui deputantur; originem a contemtu ducunt. *Ceterum si adjiciam,* &c. Every reader of Ovid will recognize the practices here alluded to. *Componi* is like *composita repetantur hora.*

[9] *de vestris.* Comp. c. 44. *apprehenduntur;* the sense here is that special one which is retained in our derivative, and which is found in the Digests. S. Cypr. ad Demetr. c. 3. *nemo nostrum, quando apprehenditur, reluctatur.* *nec interdiu;* ergo nec nocte, quo tempore furta fiunt.

[10] [*intelligi subjacet;* Hellenismus. ὑπόκειται νοεῖν sic Polyb. ὑπόκειται παθεῖν; i. e. πρόκειται ut notat Budæus. Ita fere Euseb. Ecc. Theol. p. 72, ἕπεται νοεῖν. A.] *in quo errasse se;* i. e. in quibus rebus cessarunt errare, simul ac cognoverint se erravisse antehac.

XVI. [1] This account of Tacitus (Hist. v. 3) should be carefully compared. The construction

CAP. XVI.

which you falsely accuse us. Ad Nat. I. 11.

origine gentis, etiam de ipsa tam origine, quam de nomine et religione gentis quæ voluit argumentatus, Judæos refert Ægypto expeditos, sive, ut putavit, extorres, in vastis Arabiæ locis aquarum egentissimis, cum siti macerarentur, onagris, qui forte de pastu potum petituri æstimabantur, indicibus fontis usos ob eam gratiam consimilis bestiæ superficiem consecrasse. Atque ita inde, opinor, præsumptum, nos quoque ut Judaicæ religionis propinquos[2], eidem simulacro initiari. At enim idem Cornelius Tacitus, sane ille mendaciorum loquacissimus, in eadem historia refert Cnæum Pompeium, cum Hierusalem cepisset, proptereaque[3] templum adiisset speculandis Judaicæ religionis arcanis, nullum illic reperisse simulacrum. Et utique si id colebatur, quod aliqua effigie repræsentabatur, nusquam magis quam in sacrario suo exhiberetur, eo magis, quia nec verebatur extraneos arbitros quamquam vana cultura. Solis enim sacerdotibus adire licitum, et conspectus ceterorum velo oppanso interdicebatur. Vos tamen non negabitis, et jumenta omnia et totos cantherios cum sua Epona[4] coli a vobis. Hoc forsitan improbamur, quod inter cultores omnium pecudum bestiarumque asinarii

of the sentence is '*exorsus*...*etiam argumentatus, Judæos refert*...*cum macerarentur*... *usos indicibus*... *superficiem consecrasse.*' *superficiem.* i. e. *caput;* but I have never seen the expression elsewhere.

[2] *propinquos Judaicæ religionis;* de Test. An. c. 5. *Judæos* ...*in quorum oleastro insiti sumus. initiari alicui* (sc. Deo aut sacris) is the ordinary construction in good authors.

[3] *proptereaque,* i. e. *quia cepisset.* '*jure victoriæ*' says Tacitus (v. 9); unless it is explained by *speculandis arcanis.*

[4] *cum sua Epona.* Apuleius (Met. II. 60) gives a description of the riches, the image, and the ornaments of this deity. *asinarii,* "mere ass-worshippers to the exclusion of other beasts."

tantum sumus. Sed et qui crucis nos religiosos[5] putat, consecraneus noster erit[6]. Cum lignum aliquod propitiatur, viderit habitus, dum materiæ qualitas eadem sit; viderit forma, dum id ipsum dei corpus sit. Et tamen quanto distinguitur a crucis stipite Pallas Attica, et Ceres Pharia, quæ sine effigie rudi palo et informi ligno prostat? Pars crucis est omne robur, quod erecta statione defigitur; nos, si forte[7], integrum et totum deum

[5] *Crucis religiosos;* like *crucis cultores,* but I can give no example of a similar phrase, though words of this form in late Latin frequently take a genitive, as *imperiosissimas mentis,* Pliny H. N. xxx. 1. *curiosus medicinæ,* ib. xxv. 2. In later times *religiosi* meant the regular clergy, and *religio* the vows; *homo religionis* is cited by Ducange for a monk. On the form *consecraneus* see Causaub. ad Capitol. Gordian. Vol. II. p. 97. ed. 1671, who remarks that the termination was a favourite one with the middle Latin writers. v. c. 28. Yet *consentaneus* is in good use.

[6] "As long as it is a mere piece of wood which is worshipped (*propitiatur*) and as long as the god is bodily contained in the image, it matters little what its form or external decorations are." *Viderit habitus;* This *viderit* is a common expression of Tertullian, the ellipse probably being *de se,* (Æn. x. 744) 'let it look to itself,' i. e. *nihil nostra refert.* Cicero, Ep. ad Att. XIV. 21. *Sed mihi quidem βεβίωται. Viderint juvenes.* Compare S. Cyprian de Hab. Virg. c. 3. *Viderit, inquis, qua illuc mente quis veniat, mihi tantum,* &c. So de Idol. c. 11. '*viderint si eædem merces...nobis quoque insuper usui sunt.*' and often elsewhere. Min. Felix, ad extr. '*proinde Socrates scurra Atticus viderit,*' &c.

[7] [Si forte. Ita reddit Tert. phrasin Græcam εἰ ἄρα, vel εἴπερ ἄρα. A.] The sense is: 'if we *do* worship a god of this sort,' &c. In c. 49. the same idea is expressed by *si utique.* Compare Lucretius v. 719.

Versarique potest, globus ut, si forte, pilai,
Dimidia ex parte candenti lumine tinctus.

Arnobius (VII. 32) seems to have expanded the phrase, *effigies remur submotas esse ab his longe, quoniam forma mortalis est corporis; et si forte est ulla,* &c. Tertullian argues thus: 'Your gods are nothing but straight stakes on which plaster has been formed into shape, your trophies are but wooden crosses covered with armour, your eagles but the same with various decorations. Every stake fixed in an upright position may be considered part of a cross; and yet you worship

CAP. XVI.

colimus. Diximus originem deorum vestrorum a plastis de cruce induci. Sed et Victorias adoratis, cum in tropæis cruces intestina sint tropæorum. Religio Romanorum tota castrensis signa veneratur, signa jurat, signa omnibus diis præponit. Omnes[8] illi imaginum suggestus in signis monilia crucum sunt. Siphara illa vexillorum et cantabrorum stolæ crucum sunt. Laudo diligentiam[9], noluistis nudas et incultas cruces consecrare. Alii plane humanius et verisimilius Solem credunt deum nostrum. Ad Persas, si forte, deputabimur (licet solem non in linteo depictum adoremus) habentes ipsum ubique in suo clypeo. Denique inde suspicio, quod innotuerit nos ad orientis regionem precari. Sed et plerique vestrum affectatione aliquando et cœlestia[10] adorandi ad solis ortum labia vibratis. Æque si diem solis lætitiæ indulgemus, alia longe ratione quam de religione solis[11], secundo loco ab

Ad Nat. I. 12.

many such either naked or disguised, so that even if you could prove your case against us, we should be merely found to worship that entire which you do in fragments.' Any illustrated work on classical antiquities will shew the form of standards or trophies. Cf. adv. Marc. III. 18. Adv. Jud. c. 10. Min. Fel. c. 9.

[8] "All the images which you suspend round your standards, are but as necklaces of crosses, all the banners are but as robes." *Siphara;* the word appears to be derived from the old word *sipo* or *supo* 'jacio' which is still preserved in the compound *dissupo;* it signifies a veil or awning, and is here applied to the flag as distinguished from its staff. It is employed by Min. Felix in the corresponding passage, by Arnobius (II. 18.) and by Apuleius. See too Juvenal VIII. 186. The artificial arrangement of the sentences may be observed * * * * *monilia crucum sunt* * * * * *stolæ crucum sunt.*

[9] *Laudo diligentiam.* This is a frequent ironical expression. See above c. 14. Juv. XII. 121.

[10] *et cœlestia.* i. e. *inter alia.*

[11] *de religione solis;* this is not such a genitive as that in *religio loci, patrum,* &c. but is equivalent to *propter religionem quam soli exhibemus;* and may be compared

eis sumus, qui diem Saturni otio et victui decernunt, exorbitantes et ipsi Judaico more[12], quem ignorant. Sed nova jam dei nostri in ista civitate proxime editio publicata est, ex quo quidam in frustrandis bestiis mercenarius noxius[13] picturam proposuit cum ejusmodi inscriptione: DEUS CHRISTIANORUM ΟΝΟΚΟΙΤΗΣ. Is erat auribus asininis, altero pede ungulatus, librum gestans, et togatus. Risimus et nomen et formam. Sed illi debebant adorare statim biforme numen, quia et canino et leonino capite commistos, et de capro et de ariete cornutos, et a lumbis hircos, et a cruribus serpentes, et planta vel tergo alites deos receperunt. Hæc ex abundanti, ne quid rumoris irrepercussum quasi de conscientia præterissemus[14].

CAP. XVI.

Ad Nat. I. 13.

in some respects with the expression *crucis religiosos* which occurred a few lines back. The glossary of Ducange cites *religio Dei* for *Dei cultus* from an old translation of Irenæus as if a singular example, but Lactantius uses the phrase emphatically for the Christian religion; *nec amplius quidquam contra legem aut religionem Dei fecit.* de Mort. Pers. c. 10. and elsewhere. Commodianus too (XII. 10.) has

Religio cujus in vacuo falsa curatur,

where, if I understand the passage, *in vacuo* means *inaniter*. Perhaps the text is one of the earliest instances of such an idiom.

[12] *exorbitantes et ipsi Judaico more.* I think this the most explicable reading. And the argument is this: If we do observe Sunday as a feast, we are but in the next rank to yourselves, who observe Saturday, in which you unwittingly leave your own ceremonials and customs and follow the rites of the Jews. Compare the passage ad Nat. marked in the margin.

[13] *mercenarius noxius;* of the various interpretations of these words I prefer Semler's, viz. 'a *bestiarius,* who though not actually a convict, had hired himself to fight in the amphitheatre along with such.' The character described in Ep. I. of S. Cyprian is different.

[14] S. Cyprian ad Demetr. præf. *tacere ultra non oportet ne jam non verecundiæ sed diffidentiæ esse incipiat quod tacemus, et dum criminationes falsas contemnimus refutare, videamus crimen agnoscere.* Apuleius Apolog. 404. *tamen vel mea caussa refellenda sunt......ne videar cuiquam, si quid præteriero, id agnovisse potius quam contemsisse.*'

CAP. XVII.

Quæ omnia, conversi jam ad demonstrationem religionis nostræ, repurgavimus.

Now hear our real faith and practice. We believe in the One God whom all nature proclaims.

XVII. Quod colimus [nos], deus unus est; qui totam molem istam cum omni instrumento[1] elementorum, corporum, spirituum, verbo, quo jussit, ratione, qua disposuit, virtute, qua potuit, de nihilo expressit, in ornamentum majestatis suæ: unde et Græci nomen mundo κόσμον accommodaverunt. Invisibilis est, etsi videatur; incomprehensibilis, etsi per gratiam[2] repræsentetur; inæstimabilis, etsi humanis sensibus æstimetur; ideo verus et tantus est. Ceterum quod videri communiter, quod comprehendi, quod æstimari potest[3], minus est et oculis quibus occupatur, et manibus quibus contaminatur, et sensibus quibus invenitur. Quod vero immensum est, soli sibi notum est. Hoc est quod deum æstimari facit, dum æstimari non capit[4]. Ita eum vis magnitudinis et notum hominibus objicit et ignotum. Et hæc est summa delicti nolentium

XVII. [1] *instrumento*, like *apparatu;* thus Tertullian uses both *paratura* (v. ad c. 30) and *instrumentum* for the Scriptures. See adv. Marc. IV. 1. *alterius instrumenti vel, quod magis usui est dicere, testamenti.*

[2] *per gratiam.* I cannot exactly satisfy myself of the meaning of this expression. It may be *per gratiam ipsius, qua hoc nobis privilegium concessit,* or *per gratiam in qua ipsius quasi imago adumbratur.*

[3] *Ceterum quod,* &c. *comprehendi* in this passage is evidently used like *contrectari,* as is clear from the corresponding clause *manibus quibus contaminatur;* and the paraphrase of S. Cyprian de Idol. Van. c. 2. but it will be frequently found to express intellectual comprehension. The discovery implied in the word *invenitur* is that of the attributes, not the existence, of the object, in which sense it answers to the *æstimari potest* preceding.

[4] *æstimari non capit;* "does not admit of estimation." So de Hab. Mul. c. 2. and Juv. XI. 169. But the more ordinary word in this sense is *recipio.* See Hor. Epist. II. 1. 258. Liv. XXIX. 24. *objicere* in the next sentence is simply equivalent to *offerre,* a parallelism which has been noticed before.

recognoscere, quem ignorare non possunt[5]. Vultis ex operibus ipsius tot ac talibus, quibus continemur[6], quibus sustinemur, quibus oblectamur, etiam quibus exterremur, vultis ex animæ ipsius testimonio comprobemus? Quæ licet carcere corporis pressa, licet institutionibus pravis circumscripta, licet libidinibus ac concupiscentiis evigorata[7], licet falsis diis exancillata, cum tamen resipiscit, ut ex crapula, ut ex somno, ut ex aliqua valetudine, et sanitatem suam patitur, deum nominat, hoc solo nomine, quia proprio dei veri: DEUS MAGNUS, DEUS BONUS, et QUOD DEUS DEDERIT, omnium vox est. Judicem quoque contestatur illum, DEUS VIDET, et DEO COMMENDO, et DEUS MIHI REDDET. O testimonium animæ naturaliter Christianæ! Denique pronuntians hæc, non ad Capitolium, sed ad cœlum respicit. Novit enim sedem dei vivi; ab illo, et inde descendit[8]. CAP. XVII.

XVIII. Sed quo plenius et impressius tam ipsum quam dispositiones ejus et voluntates adire- Who sent us prophets, and gave us his word.

[5] So S. Cyprian, in an apposite passage de Idol. Van. c. 2. '*Atque hæc est summa delicti, nolle agnoscere, quem ignorare non possis.*'

[6] *quibus continemur;* the expression has been illustrated ad c. 11.

[7] *evigorata;* like *evirare*, Catull. LXII. 17. Arnob. v. 36. S. Cypr. Ep. I. *exancillata;* δεδουλωμένη, *ancillari alicui* is old, though obsolete, Latin. It occurs once in Apuleius de dog. Plat. 586. The *ex* has either little force at all in the compound, as in *excondere* adv. Marc. v. 18. or *expingere* de cult. Fæm. c. I. or it may add strength to the word, as in *edurus* Virg. Georg. II. 65. (varr. lect.) IV. 145.

On the argument, compare its amplification in the special treatise *de Testimonio animæ*, together with S. Cyprian quoted above, Min. Felix, c. 5; and Arnobius, II. 2.

[8] *ab illo* sc. *Deo; inde* i. e. *ab ejus sede.* But *inde* and *unde* are both occasionally used of persons as well as place. See Gesner ad Quintil. VI. 1.

CAP. XVIII.

mus, instrumentum adjecit litteraturæ[1], si qui[2] velit de deo inquirere, et inquisito invenire, et invento credere, et credito deservire. Viros enim justitia et innocentia dignos deum nosse et ostendere a primordio in seculum emisit[3] spiritu divino inundatos[4], quo prædicarent deum unicum esse, qui universa condiderit, qui hominem de humo struxerit; hic enim est verus Prometheus; qui seculum certis temporum dispositionibus et exitibus ordinaverit; exinde qui signa majestatis suæ judicantis[5] ediderit per imbres, per ignes; qui demerendo sibi disciplinas determinaverit[6], quas ignoratis aut deseritis; sed et observantibus his præmia destinarit, ut qui prodacto ævo isto judicaturus[7] sit suos cultores in

XVIII. [1] *Litteraturæ.* v. ad c. 30.

[2] *Si qui*—So Tertullian commonly for *quis*, as Apuleius also, (e.g. Met. II. 35.) and Ammianus.

[3] *in seculum emisit;* some observations on the various uses of the word *seculum* will be found ad c. 26. In this sentence it means *hoc sæculum, hanc vitam,* or *mundum;* a little below it has another sense, meaning the space allotted for the existence of this world, which is expressed just after by *ævum istud. ordinaverit* is equivalent to *instruxerit,* v. c. 11. and *temporum* is simply "seasons."

[4] *inundatos;* this is an expansion of an ordinary figurative expression, "*effundam de Spiritu meo super servos meos et prophetabunt.*" S. Cyprian (Ep. I.) embodies the idea of Tertullian; *profluens largiter spiritus nullis finibus premitur; manat jugiter, exuberat affluenter,* and a little afterwards uses the same phrase, *tantum gratiæ inundantis haurimus.*

[5] *Majestatis suæ judicantis.* See c. 4. I would not join *judicantis* with *per,* but connect *ediderit signa per,* &c. and leave the signification of the participle absolute. So S. Cyprian de Unit. Eccles. c. 3. *in conspectu statim Domini vindicantis extincti.*

[6] *qui demerendo sibi.* 'Who fixed ordinances by which men might please Him.'

[7] *judicare in retributionem;* this is just as if it had been *assignare cultoribus suis vitæ æternæ retributionem,* a sense of *examinandi* and *pronuntiandi* being implied in *judicare.* The *prodacto* means *prodacto in nihilum* as written fully in c. 48. Compare

CAP. XVIII.

vitæ æternæ retributionem, profanos in ignem æque perpetem et jugem, suscitatis omnibus ab initio defunctis et reformatis et recensitis ad utriusque meriti dispunctionem. Hæc et nos risimus aliquando. De vestris fuimus; fiunt, non nascuntur Christiani. Quos diximus prædicatores, prophetæ de officio præfandi vocantur. Voces eorum itemque virtutes[8], quas ad fidem divinitatis edebant, in thesauris litterarum manent, nec istæ nunc latent. Ptolemæus, quem Philadelphum supernominant, eruditissimus rex, et omnis litteraturæ sagacissimus, cum studio bibliothecarum Pisistratum, opinor, æmularetur, inter cetera memoriarum[9] quibus aut vetustas aut curiositas aliqua ad famam patrocinabatur, ex suggestu[10] Demetrii Phalerei grammaticorum tunc probatissimi, cui præfecturam mandaverat, libros a Judæis quoque postulavit, proprias [scilicet] atque vernaculas litteras, quas soli

S. Cypr. de Unit. Eccl. c. 4. *si confessionem suam mala conversatione prodegerit* i. e. *irritam fecerit.*

[8] *virtutes* i. e. *potestates*, δυνάμεις. *ad fidem divinitatis*, sc. suæ probandam.

[9] *Memoriæ monumenta*, see cap. seq. "memoirs." Sueton. Claud. I. *Nec contentus elogium tumulo ejus versibus a se compositis insculpsisse, etiam vitæ memoriam prosa oratione composuit.* S. Cypr. ad Demetr. c. 3. *ut memorias taceamus antiquas.* Min. Fel. c. 1. *specta de libris memorias.* Arnobius has the phrase *memorialia scripta.* VI. 11. *quibus vetustas,* &c. i. e. *quibus v. aut c. famæ aliquid conciliaret. patrocinari ad famam* is something like *judicare in retributionem.*

[10] *ex suggestu*, "at the suggestion;" this is not a good nor a usual signification even of *suggero*, (c. 33.) and it is still more equivocal in *suggestus*, but it may be found in the Digests. *præfecturam*, i. e. *bibliothecæ*. the *vernaculæ literæ* are the original Hebrew characters, what are called below *literæ Hebrææ*, in contradistinction to the *literæ Judææ* of that day which would have been Syro-Chaldaic. See Josephus Ant. Jud. XII, 2.

CAP. XVIII.

habebant. Ex ipsis[11] enim et ad ipsos semper prophetæ peroraverant, scilicet ad domesticam dei gentem ex patrum gratia. Hebræi retro, qui nunc Judæi; igitur et litteræ Hebrææ, et eloquium. Sed ne notitia vacaret[12], hoc quoque Ptolemæo a Judæis subscriptum est, septuaginta et duobus interpretibus indultis, quos Menedemus quoque philosophus providentiæ vindex de sententiæ communione suspexit[13]. Affirmavit hæc vobis etiam Aristæas. Ita in Græcum stylum ex aperto monimenta reliquit[14]. Hodie apud Serapeum[15] Ptolemæi bibliothecæ cum ipsis Hebraicis litteris exhibentur. Sed et Judæi palam lectitant; vectigalis libertas: vulgo aditur sabbatis omnibus. Qui audierit, inveniet deum; qui etiam studuerit intelligere, cogetur et credere.

[11] *ex ipsis*—i. e. *ipsi ex eorum numero. ex patrum gratia* means *ex gratia qua fuerant patres ipsorum apud Deum.*

[12] *vacaret.* see c. 1. *subscriptum est,* see c. 6. The construction of the sentence is I think: *hoc quoque subscriptum est...interpretibus indultis,* so that *hoc* does not refer to any idea contained in *notitia,* but to *indultis,* as if it had been written *hoc quoque, ut indulgerentur, subscriptum est.*

[13] *suspexit,* like ἀποβλέπειν. as observed ad c. 24. *oportere et præsides pariter suspici.* The expression *de sententiæ communione* may certainly be explained grammatically of the coincidence of translations, but I should much rather refer it to the agreement of Menedemus and the LXX. on the fundamental point of a *providentia.* In either case *de* marks the cause of the *suspectio.*

[14] Constr. *Ita ex-aperto reliquit monimenta* (*memorias*) *in Græcum stylum* [*versa*]; the nominative to *reliquit* should be Ptolemæus. *Vectigalis libertas;* "liberty is purchased by payment of a tax;" the remark perhaps is a little sarcastical. See Tertullian's sentiments on this point de Fuga in Pers. c. 12. *aditur* I think should be taken impersonally.

[15] *Serapeum. In quo* (sc. Serapeo) *bibliothecæ fuerunt inæstimabiles, et loquitur monumentorum veterum concinens fides, septingenta voluminum millia Ptolemæis regibus vigiliis intentis composita, bello Alexandrino conflagrasse.* Ammian. Marcell. XXII. 16.

CAP. XIX.

Which, if you look even to its antiquity, far surpasses all your records; as could be certainly, though tediously, proved.

XIX. Primam igitur instrumentis istis auctoritatem summa antiquitas vindicat. Apud vos quoque religionis est instar, fidem de temporibus asserere[1].

[*Quæ sequuntur uncis inclusa primus e cod. Fuldensi Havercampus publici juris fecit, sed alteri scriptoris recognitioni tribuens sub finem editionis suæ exprimenda curavit.*]

[Primus enim prophetes Moyses, qui mundi conditionem[2] et generis humani pullulationem et mox ultricem iniquitatis illius ævi vim cataclysmi de præterito exorsus est, per vaticinationem usque ad suam ætatem et deinceps per res suas futurorum imagines edidit, penes quem et temporum ordo digestus ab initio supputationem seculi præstitit: superior invenitur annis circiter trecentis, quam ille antiquissimus penes vos Danaus in Argo transvenisset; Trojano denique prœlio[3] ad mille annos ante est, unde et ipso Saturno. Secundum enim historiam Thalli[4], qua relatum

XIX. [1] *Fidem de temporibus asserere*, 'to defend the truth of a statement from its antiquity.'

[2] *Mundi conditionem*; i. e. *creationem*. Compare de Spectac. c. 2. *quando hæc sit tota ratio damnationis, perversa administratio conditionis a conditis*, and de Hab. Mul. c. 8. *Dei conditio est et thus et merum et ignis*, which is the *thura et merum et ignem Deus instituit* of Cyprian de Hab. Virg. c. 2. The apodosis of the sentence commences at *edidit*: 'For Moses, who set out with relating from times earlier than his own the creation, the propagation of our species, and the subsequent punishment of the deluge, published also, through the spirit of prophecy, &c.' On the general argument of this chapter see the introductory preface.

[3] *prœlio* is the dative after *ante est*, which must be taken closely together like *anteit*.

[4] Thallus. This historian is mentioned again presently, and is

CAP. XIX.

est bellum Assyriorum et Saturnum Titanorum regem cum Jove dimicasse, ostenditur bellum CCCXX et duobus annis Iliacum exitium antecessisse. Per hunc Moysen etiam illa lex propria Judæis a deo missa est. Deinceps multa[5]; et alii prophetæ vetustiores litteris vestris. Nam et qui ultimo cecinit, aut aliquantulo præcucurrit, aut certe concurrit ætate sapientiæ auctoribus, etiam latoribus legis. Cyri enim et Darii regno fuit Zacharias, quo in tempore Thales, physicorum princeps, sciscitanti Crœso nihil certum de divinitate respondit, turbatus scilicet vocibus prophetarum. Solon eidem regi finem longæ vitæ intuendum prædicavit non aliter, quam prophetæ[6]; adeo respici potest[7], tam jura vestra quam studia de lege deque divina doctrina concepisse. Quod prius est, hoc sit semen necesse est. Inde quædam nobiscum vel prope nos habetis[8]. De sophia amor ejus philosophia vocitatus est, de prophetia affectatio ejus poeticam vaticinationem deputavit. Gloriæ

quoted in c. 10. beyond which we have little knowledge of him. Lactantius (Ep. D. I. c. 24.) alludes to his Assyrian History. The construction is *qua relatum est bellum* * * * *et dimicasse*, i. e. et quod dimicavit.

[5] *Deinceps multa*, some propose *multi* here, and others imagine a hiatus, but I think the text is intelligible as I have punctuated it. *qui ultimo cecinit. canere* is here used absolutely for *prophetavit* as often elsewhere.

[6] Ps. XXXVIII. 5. Locutus sum in lingua mea: notum fac mihi Domini finem meum, et numerum dierum meorum quis est.

[7] *adeo respici potest concepisse.* sc. Solon. the constr. and sense seem to be: *adeo respicere possumus et videre ut ille conceperit*, &c.

[8] "From this circumstance (viz. that your legislators were indebted to our sacred doctrines) it happens that you hold certain tenets either in common with us, or nearly resembling ours." *deputavit de prophetia;* in the old sense of *puto* like *amputavit*, v. c. 4.

homines[9], si quid invenerant, ut proprium facerent, adulteraverunt; etiam fructibus a semine degenerare contigit. Multis adhuc de vetustate modis consisterem[10] divinarum litterarum, si non major auctoritas illis ad fidem de veritatis suæ viribus, quam de ætatis annalibus suppetisset. Quid[11] enim potentius patrocinabitur testimonio earum, nisi dispunctio quotidiana[12] seculi totius, cum dispositiones regnorum, cum casus urbium, cum exitus gentium, cum status temporum ita omnibus respondent, quemadmodum ante millia annorum prænuntiabantur? Unde et spes nostra, quam ridetis, animatur, et fiducia, quam præsumptionem[13] vocatis, corroboratur. Idonea est enim recognitio præteritorum ad disponendam fiduciam futurorum: eædem voces prædi- CAP. XIX.

[9] *gloriæ homines.* If the text is correct here it must be equivalent to *homines gloriæ dediti* or *gloriæ libidinosi*, as in c. 47, like *vir justitiæ*, &c. as indeed Dr Ashton wishes to read at the beginning of c. 18. But I can hardly conceive this probable, though we have *philosophus gloriæ animal* de Anim. c. 1. In Apuleius (Apol. 523.) *homo morum* occurs, which is certainly a parallel curiosity: the passage however is obelized, but Oudendorp in a long note defends both the text and the phrase. Vol. II. p. 556. ed. 4to. In Pliny too (H. N. XXX. 6) *Apion grammaticæ artis* occurs, but this is not exactly similar. *homo Dei* is a pure Hebraism, but it is used as *Dei cultor* S. Cypr. ad Demetr. 4. and the reader should not overlook its sense in the New Testament, ad Tim. II. iii. 17.

[10] *consisterem*, v. ad c. 4. The whole of the following argument is repeated and developed in c. 20; which seems to favour the opinion that this chapter was written by Tertullian in a different edition of his Apology.

[11] *Quid...potentius...nisi; nisi* for *quam.* So *quam* appears to be used for *nisi*, ad Uxor. I. 4. '*nihil viduitati apud Deum subsignatæ necessarium est, quam perseverare.*' Though of course an ellipse of *aliud* may be understood there. So as de Idol. 20. '*quid erit dejeratio, quam prævaricatio.*'

[12] *dispunctio quotidiana*; the daily fulfilment, and, as it were, striking out, of some prophecy. *Sæculum* is here the *corpus temporum* or *eventorum* (c. 26,) amongst which are the *dispositiones, exitus*, &c.

[13] *præsumptionem*, v. ad c. 1.

CAP. XIX.

caverunt utramque partem, eædem litteræ notaverunt. Unum est tempus[14] apud illas, quod apud nos separari videtur. Ita omnia quæ supersunt improbata, probata sunt nobis, quia cum illis, quæ probata sunt, tunc futuris prædicabantur. Habetis, quod sciam, et vos Sibyllam, quatenus appellatione ista vera vates dei veri passim super ceteros, qui vaticinari videbantur, usurpata est, sicut vestræ Sibyllæ nomen de veritate mentitæ, quemadmodum et dei vestri[15].

Omnes itaque substantias, omnesque materias, origines, ordines[16], venas veterani cujusque styli

[14] *Unum est tempus*, i.e. "Time, which to us appears in a threefold character, past, present, and future, is with them but one." So in the next chapter, *unum tempus est divinationi futura præfanti apud homines;* comp. S. Cyprian de Mort. c. 1. *Fiunt ecce quæ dicta sunt, et quando fiunt quæ ante prædicta sunt, sequentur et quæcunque promissa sunt.*

[15] This passage is probably corrupt, and conjectures have been pretty freely exercised upon it. It has been entirely reformed as follows: "Habemus, quod sciam, et nos Sibyllam quatenus appellatio ista veræ vatis dei veri passim super ceteras quæ vaticinari videbantur, usu probata est. Sciunt vestræ Sibyllæ, nomen de veritate mentitæ, quemadmodum et dei vestri." *Usurpare* for *vocare* is perfectly good Latin, v. Wakef. ad Lucret. I. 55, the last clause of the sentence alludes to an opinion frequently advanced by Tertullian, that the gods of the heathens though calling themselves *dei* were really *dæmones*. e. g. c. 29, *tam se dæmonem confitebitur de vero, quam et alibi deum de falso.*

[16] Tertullian has here accumulated, in a way by no means unusual with him, a number of expressions to add force to his sentence, without perhaps thinking whether each was severally applicable or not. He means only to assert that all that the Romans possessed of antiquity was far inferior to a single sheet of one of the prophets. *materiæ* is in the sense often used by Quintilian speaking of *suasoriæ, judiciales materiæ*, &c. and *substantiæ* is pretty similar; *origines* was a frequent term for works or local or national antiquities, half a dozen tracts have come down to us with such a title, and it is so used also in our own days; *ordines* may be like *ordo rerum* in Æn. VII. 44: and *vena* by a common metaphor.

vestri, gentes etiam plerasque et urbes insignes[17], historiarum canas[18] et memoriarum, ipsas denique effigies litterarum[19], indices custodesque rerum, et (puto adhuc minus dicimus[20]) ipsos inquam deos vestros, ipsa templa et oracula et sacra unius interim prophetæ scrinium seculis vincit, in quo videtur thesaurus collocatus totius Judaici sacramenti, et inde etiam nostri. Si quem audistis interim Moysen, Argivo Inacho pariter ætate est; quadringentis pæne annis, nam et septem minus, Danaum, et ipsum apud vos vetustissimum, prævenit, mille circiter cladem Priami antecedit; possem etiam dicere, quingentis amplius[21] et Homerum, habens quos sequar. Ceteri quoque prophetæ, etsi Moysi postumant, extremissimi tamen eorum non restrosiores deprehenduntur primoribus vestris sapientibus et legiferis et historicis[22]. Hæc quibus ordi- CAP. XIX.

[17] *urbes insignes* refers to the peculiar pride which certain cities took in their remote antiquity. In the Roman poets no laudatory epithet of a city is more common than *antiqua*.

[18] *historiarum canas.* There is here considerable variety in the reading; *cana* (as *clausa domorum*, &c.) *arcana* and *caussas* being substitutes for *canas*. The obvious meaning is "the oldest records that you have."

[19] *Effigies litterarum;* these appear to be hieroglyphics. Lucan. III. 222.

Nondum flumineas Memphis contexere biblos
Noverat: et saxis tantum, volucresque feræque,
Sculptaque servabant magicas animalia linguas.

[20] *puto adhuc minus dicimus.* "I doubt I am here using an anticlimax." *Seculis vincit;* "surpasses in antiquity." A little below *pariter* must be equivalent to *par* if the text is sound.

[21] *quingentis amplius*, i. e. five hundred more, *mille et quingentis. postumant;* "are later in date." I believe this word is almost peculiar to Tertullian; he opposes it to *anticipare* de Resur. Car. c. 45. *extremissimi;* So Apuleius *postremius* de Deo S. 670.

[22] *historicis:* for *historiarum scriptoribus* as Juv. VII. 98, 104. The word is found in this sense in Cicero.

CAP. XIX.

nibus probari possint, non tam difficile est nobis exponere, quam enorme, nec arduum, sed interim longum. Multis instrumentis, cum digitorum supputariis gesticulis assidendum est. Reseranda antiquissimarum etiam gentium archiva, Ægyptiorum, Chaldæorum, Phœnicum; advocandi etiam municipes eorum[23], per quos notitia subministrata est; aliqui Manethon Ægyptius, et Berosus Chaldæus, sed et Iromus Phœnix Tyri rex; sectatores quoque eorum Mendesius Ptolemæus, et Menander Ephesius, et Demetrius Phalereus, et rex Juba, et Appion, et Thallus, et, qui istos aut probat aut revincit[24], Judæus Josephus antiquitatum Judaicarum vernaculus vindex. Græcorum etiam censuales conferendi, et quæ quando sint gesta, ut concatenationes temporum aperiantur, per quæ luceant annalium numeri. Peregrinandum est in historias et litteras orbis[25]. Et tamen quasi partem jam probationis intulimus, quum per quæ probari possint, aspersi-

[23] *advocandi etiam*, &c. I am not quite sure that I rightly apprehend this passage, but I believe that Tertullian in shewing the magnitude of the task says: We shall have to investigate the archives of the most antient people, and to summon to our aid natives of the same country with those old writers who hand us down this information, e. g. some modern Manetho from Egypt to explain Manetho, and some new Berosus from Chaldæa to interpret Berosus; and we must then collate their disciples and antagonists. I have thus taken *municipes* like *municipes Jovis*, Juv. XIV. 271, and I think Tertullian means that interpreters (as in the last chapter) must be brought in to expound records otherwise unintelligible.

[24] *revincit*. See ad c. 1.

[25] *peregrinari in aliquo loco* is to sojourn in any foreign place; *peregrinari in aliquem locum* is to travel to a foreign country, the *in* being like *ire in aliquem locum*; an idea of expatriation being also implied. So Cicero says *injiciens se animus in hanc regionum magnitudinem, longe lateque peregrinatur*. The sense of the text is "we must make excursions into the literature of the universe."

mus. Verum differre præstat, ne vel minus persequamur festinando, vel diutius evagemur persequendo.

CAP. XIX.

XX. Plus jam offerimus pro ista dilatione, majestatem scripturarum, si non vetustatem; divinas probamus, si dubitatur antiquas[1]. Nec hoc tardius aut aliunde discendum; coram sunt, quæ docebunt, mundus, et seculum, et exitus. Quicquid agitur, prænuntiabatur; quicquid videtur, audiebatur[2]. Quod terræ vorant urbes, quod insulas maria fraudant[3]; quod externa atque interna bella dilaniant; quod regnis regna compulsant; quod fames et lues et locales quæque clades et frequentiæ[4] pleraque montium vastant; quod humiles subli-

Instead of such tedious process, take its internal evidence; its prophecies both verified and in course of verification.

XX. This is one of those chapters in which Tertullian's peculiar eloquence is conspicuous, and to which I have alluded in the introduction; the other such in this treatise are 12, 30, 48 and 50; and the reader anxious to familiarize himself with the peculiarities of his author will do well to recur to them frequently.

[1] *si dubitatur antiquas;* sc. *eas esse.* I see no reason for any emendation here. *tardius aut aliunde;* "by any slow process, or through any distant proofs;" alluding of course to those suggested in the last chapter; *hoc* is emphatic.

[2] The calamities here enumerated, and of which many may be easily explained by the condition of the empire in its decline, (comp. Tac. Hist. I. 2. and Sall. B. C. 2 and 10.) were ascribed by the Pagans to the introduction of the Christian religion, and the consequent neglect of the gods. This charge is perpetually alluded to in the Apologies, and gave specially occasion to two celebrated compositions, the *Civitas Dei* of S. Augustine, and the *Disputationes* of Arnobius.

[3] *insulas maria fraudant;* i.e. "encroach upon, or swallow up:" the expression is very like one of Lucan's. *dilaniant;* I would supply *regnum,* or something like it. *compulsant;* the substantive *compulsatio* occurs in the succeeding chapter and c. 38. Compare with the passage generally. Isai. xl. 4. Ezech. xxi. 31. S. Matth. xxiv. 6, 7. *locales* answers to the κατὰ τόπους of the Evangelist, as Dr Ashton has well remarked. S. Cyprian (de Mort. c. 1) has *per loca singula.*

[4] *frequentiæ montium;* this is interpreted by almost all com-

CAP. XX. mitate, sublimes humilitate mutantur[5]; quod justitia rarescit, iniquitas increbrescit, bonarum omnium disciplinarum cura torpescit; quod etiam officia temporum et elementorum munia exorbitant; quod et monstris et portentis naturalium forma turbatur, providenter[6] scripta sunt. Dum patimur, leguntur; dum recognoscimus, probantur. Idoneum, opinor, testimonium divinitatis veritas divinationis. Hinc igitur apud nos futurorum quoque fides tuta est, jam scilicet probatorum, quia cum illis, quæ quotidie probantur, prædicebantur. Eadem voces sonant, eadem litteræ notant, idem spiritus pulsat, unum tempus est[7] divinationi futura præfanti apud

Just. 66.

mentators to mean *feræ*, and even Dr Ashton accumulates three or four marginal quotations to shew that wild beasts descend from mountains. But though *feræ* may be said *frequentare montes* and called *montivagæ* or *monticultrices*, and though *montes* may be termed *feris frequentissimi*, yet *frequentiæ montium*, taken absolutely for *feræ*, appears a most extraordinary phrase; *mortium* is another reading which leaves a more accessible sense; but I believe that wild beasts are somehow implied, for such a plague is expressly mentioned among those threatened in the prophecies to which Tertullian here alludes, and which should be referred to for the proper understanding of the text. e. g. Ezech. v. 17. *et immittam in vos bestias pessimas usque ad internecionem*; compare Levit. xxvi. 22. *immittamque in vos bestias agri*, and other passages. Cicero too De Off. II. 5. amongst the causes which check population enumerates *beluarum repentinam multitudinem*, and Tertullian as an African (*leonum arida nutrix*) might have witnessed such inflictions. In any case *pleraque* is the accusative after *vastant*, which refers to all the four nominatives, its collocation before a genitive with which it has no connection being not an unusual one.

[5] *humiles sublimitate*, &c. v. Ezech. xxi. 26, S. Luc. i. 52.

[6] *providenter* here is like *per præscientiam*.

[7] *unum tempus est*, &c. "Time, with prophecy, has but a single character, though it may be distinguished in the course of fulfilment of predictions, by the future passing into the present, and the present into the past." I thus take *deputatur* like *amputatur* (see c. 19.) So Persius in a passage often misunderstood, *hoc*

CAP. XX.

homines, si forte distinguitur dum expungitur, dum ex futuro præsens, dehinc ex præsenti præteritum deputatur. Quid delinquimus, oro vos[8], futura quoque credentes, qui jam didicimus illis per duos gradus credere?

XXI. Sed[1] quoniam edidimus, antiquissimis Judæorum instrumentis sectam istam esse suffultam, quam aliquanto novellam, ut Tiberiani temporis, plerique sciunt, profitentibus nobis quoque; fortasse an hoc nomine de statu ejus retractetur, quasi sub umbraculo insignissimæ religionis, certe licitæ[2],

And now hear in detail our history of Christ: and if this be true what becomes of your religion?

quod loquor, inde est, i. e. ab illâ amputatum.

[8] *Quid delinquimus,* &c. "What error then do we commit, if we believe certain events *will* come to pass, instructed as we have been in this belief, through the verified predictions concerning the past and the present." I have supposed an ellipse of *alia ista* after *futura,* but the construction may very possibly be different, e. g. *in futura.*

XXI. [1] Constr. *Sed quoniam edidimus ......fortasse retractetur hoc nomine......quasi abscondat...... vel quia agimus. fortasse an,* &c.; "possibly a further enquiry about its nature may be made on these grounds, viz. that either," &c. The argument is this: As I have claimed the authority of a most ancient religion for one notoriously recent, you will ask what are the points of our difference, and why we are not in communion with the Jews whom we thus appeal to. And Tertullian presently proceeds to prove that the Christians *did* acknowledge the God of the Jews, although they were not ashamed of Christ. *de Christo erubescere,* S. Matth. viii. 38. S. Luc. ix. 26.

[2] *certe licitæ;* "at all events a legalized religion." The old law forbidding the Romans from introducing new gods is preserved by Cicero. SEPARATIM NEMO HABESSIT DEOS, NEVE NOVOS: SED NE ADVENAS NISI PVBLICE ADSCITOS PRIVATIM COLVNTO. We have seen before in this apology that a *senatus-consultum* was necessary for this, and also that the Jewish synagogues *were* lawfully frequented, under penalties. *Religio licita* thus became a formal term, and one to which the Christian doctrines in Tertullian's time had no claim; their congregations indeed were considered *factiones,* a circumstance alluded to presently in c. 38, 39. And whatever favour Christianity might accidentally experience from individual authorities, still it was not a *religio licita* till the

CAP. XXI.

aliquid propriæ præsumptionis abscondat, vel quia præter ætatem[3], neque de victus exceptionibus, neque de sollemnitatibus dierum, neque de ipso signaculo corporis, neque de consortio nominis cum Judæis agimus, quod utique oporteret, si eidem deo manciparemur? Sed et vulgus jam scit Christum, hominem utique aliquem, qualem Judæi judicaverunt, quo facilius quis nos hominis cultores[4] existimaverit. Verum neque de Christo erubescimus, quum sub nomine ejus deputari[5] et damnari juvat, neque de deo aliter præsumimus. Necesse est igitur pauca dicamus de Christo ut deo[6]. Tantum Judæis erat apud deum gratia, ubi et insignis justitia et fides originalium auctorum, unde illis et generis magnitudo et regni sublimitas floruit, et tanta felicitas, ut dei vocibus, quibus edocebantur, de promerendo deo, et non offendendo, præmonerentur. Sed quanta deliquerint, fiducia patrum inflati, derivantes[7] a disciplina in profanum modum, etsi ipsi non confiterentur, probaret exitus hodier-

time of Gallienus (A. D. 259) who, by assigning certain lands to a congregation of Christians, recognized the legal existence of the corporation which could not otherwise have possessed common property. See a learned chapter of Neander, Ch. Hist. § I. 2.

The other charge that Christianity was not a *religion* but a *sect*, has not escaped the notice of Gibbon. Vol. II. p. 161. ed. 8vo.

[3] *præter ætatem;* "in addition to the difference in antiquity."—Five points of discrepancy are mentioned, 1. the antiquity. 2. the forbidden foods. 3. holidays. 4. *signaculum corporis* (baptism in one case, and circumcision in the other). 5. the name.

[4] *hominis cultores,* emphatically, i. e. and not of a beast.

[5] *deputari,* sc. *in pœnam,* ut de Habit. Mul. c. 1. *quum* introduces a proof of the fact asserted, not the time of its occurrence; it is *since,* not *when.*

[6] If the text is sound, the constr. probably is: *Tanta erat gratia...(ubi...unde floruit) et tanta felicitas...ut præmonerentur.*

[7] *derivantes,* see c. 6.

CAP. XXI.

nus ipsorum. Dispersi, palabundi, et cœli et soli sui extorres vagantur per orbem sine homine[8], sine deo rege, quibus nec advenarum jure terram patriam saltem vestigio salutare conceditur. Cum hæc illis sanctæ voces præminarentur, eædem fere semper omnes ingerebant[9] fore, uti sub extimis curriculis seculi ex omni jam gente et populo et loco cultores sibi allegeret deus multo fideliores, in quos gratiam transferret, et pleniorem quidem ob disciplinæ auctioris capacitatem. Hujus igitur gratiæ disciplinæque arbiter et magister, illuminator atque deductor[10] generis humani, filius dei annunciabatur, non quidem ita genitus, ut erubescat de filii nomine aut de patris semine; non de sororis incesto, nec de stupro filiæ aut conjugis alienæ deum patrem passus est[11], squamatum aut cornutum aut plumatum ama-

[8] *sine homine, sine deo rege;* Scaliger corrected this *sine nomine;* and though possibly the allusion may be to the old theocracy which the Jews had forfeited, as well as their native line of sovereigns, yet upon the whole I should think the text unsound. *nec advenarum jure* means 'not even in the character of strangers.'

[9] *ingerebant;* "perpetually urged the fact, that," &c. the general sense of *ingerere* is to thrust a thing repeatedly and even obtrusively on a person; (Juv. VI. 609) so S. Cyprian ad Demetr. c. 1. *malles tua impudenter ingerere quam nostra patienter audire;* the force of *eædem* in this sentence is: the selfsame prophecies which foretold their now verified dispersion, and which therefore should command their belief, foretold also, &c. *ob disciplinæ auctioris capacitatem.* [scilicet, quia illi, contra quam Judæi, humiles erant ac dociles et ad amplectendam Christi disciplinam εὔθετοι καὶ τεταγμένοι atque, ut ait S. Lucas, ἀσμένως ἀπεδέξαντο τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ. A.]

[10] *deductor.* This was a term applied to the guide in the Eleusinian mysteries. Tertullian twice uses the expression *deductor veritatis* with reference to the Spiritus Sanctus.

[11] *passus est;* this expression is nearly equivalent to *expertus est,* or *habuit; patrem de stupro* is like *per stuprum.*

CAP. XXI.

torem, aut in aurum conversum: Jovis enim ista sunt numina vestri. Ceterum dei filius nullam de impudicitia habet matrem, etiam quam videtur habere non nupserat. Sed prius substantiam edisseram, et ita nativitatis qualitas intelligetur. Jam ediximus deum universitatem hanc mundi verbo et ratione et virtute molitum. Apud vestros quoque sapientes λόγον, id est sermonem atque rationem, constat artificem videri universitatis. Hunc enim Zeno determinat factitatorem, qui cuncta in dispositione[12] formaverit, eundem et fatum vocari, et deum et animum Jovis, et necessitatem omnium rerum. Hæc Cleanthes in spiritum congerit[13], quem permeatorem universitatis affirmat. Et nos etiam sermoni atque rationi itemque virtuti, per quæ omnia molitum deum ediximus, propriam[14] substantiam spiritum inscribimus, cui et sermo insit pronuntianti, et ratio adsit disponenti, et virtus præsit perficienti. Hunc ex deo prolatum didicimus, et prolatione generatum, et iccirco filium dei et deum dictum ex unitate substantiæ. Nam et deus

[12] *dispositione*. *dispono* and *dispositio* are expressions of frequent occurrence on the subject of cosmogony, both in christian and heathen writers. See before c. 17.

[13] *Hæc Cleanthes*, &c. "These offices Cleanthes accumulates on a certain spirit, which he makes to pervade the universe." *permeatorem;* like the *mens infusa* of Virgil.

[14] [propriam substantiam, i. e. *ἰδίαν οὐσίαν* ut dicit Origen in Jo. p. 56. sc. *ὑπόστασιν*. Et cum radius; v. adv. Praxean, c. 2, 3, 8, 9, 13, 19, 21, 26, et Lactant. 4. 29. Tertullianus hic probare aggreditur primo substantiæ unitatem exemplo solis cum radio suo, deinde personarum differentiam, exemplo luminis de lumine. Sic igitur legendus et distinguendus mihi videtur totus hic locus—*ut, cum radius ex s. p. portio* (sc. est) *ex summa; sed Sol erit......expanditur: ita de S. S, et de Deo Deus, ut lumen de l. accensum; manet......mutueris; ita et quod......unus ambo; modulo* —A.]

CAP. XXI.

spiritus. Et cum[15] radius ex sole porrigitur, portio ex summa; sed sol erit in radio, quia solis est radius, nec separatur substantia, sed extenditur. Ita de spiritu spiritus, et de deo deus, ut lumen de lumine accensum. Manet integra et indefecta materiæ matrix, etsi plures inde traduces qualitatum mutueris: ita et quod de deo profectum est, deus est, et dei filius, et unus ambo. [Ita et de spiritu spiritus[16], et de deo deus] modulo alterum, non numero, gradu, non statu fecit, et a matrice non recessit, sed excessit. Iste igitur dei radius, ut retro semper prædicabatur[17], delapsus in virginem quandam, et in utero ejus caro figuratus, nascitur homo deo mistus. Caro spiritu instructa

[15] *et cum*, &c. *et* is frequently employed in this manner to introduce a parallel instance or example.

[16] [de Spiritu Spiritus. Filius sc. *πνευματικῶς ἡνωμένος τῷ πατρί.* Ignat. ad Smyrn. Just. Mar. in Dial. cum Tryph. dicit filium esse *ἀριθμῷ ἕτερόν τι*, i.e. aliam a patre personam nempe, *modulo alterum* ut ait Tertull. seu proprietatibus *προσωπικαῖς*, non alium *numero* Deum; sed plenius hæc explicantur Cont. Prax c. 2. A.]

[17] *ut retro semper prædicabatur.* V. Esai. vii. 14. The sense of speaking forth openly and boldly which *prædicare* and *profari* both have, makes it very natural that they should be applied in their ordinary signification to the speech of a prophet, and so we find *profari* often used (e. g. Lucret. I. 740) of a solemn announcement without any idea of foresight being implied. Such may be the meaning of *prædicare* here, though probably the reader may be inclined to think that Tertullian uses it for *prædicare* on comparing the three following passages. inf. *id super Christo prædicatum non scierunt.* de fuga in pers. c. 6. *atquin persecutiones eos passuros prædicabat et tolerandas docebat,* in which chapter *prædicare* happens to be repeatedly used in its ordinary sense; and in c. 12 of the last quoted tract, *persecutiones prædicatas non præcaveret;* in c. 18. too of this Apology, he unquestionably considers the terms as synonymous, *quos diximus prædicatores prophetæ de officio præfandi vocantur.* In the Vulgate *prædicator* is 'preacher,' but in Ps. lxviii. 11. the word is *evangelizans.*

CAP. XXI.

nutritur, adolescit, affatur, docet, operatur et Christus est. Recipite interim hanc fabulam, similis est vestris, dum ostendimus, quomodo Christus probetur. Sciebant et qui penes vos[18] ejusmodi fabulas æmulas ad destructionem veritatis istiusmodi præministraverunt. Sciebant et Judæi venturum esse Christum, scilicet quibus prophetæ loquebantur. Nam et nunc adventum ejus expectant, nec alia magis inter nos et illos compulsatio est, quam quod jam venisse non credunt. Duobus[19] enim adventibus ejus significatis, primo, qui jam expunctus est, in humilitate conditionis humanæ; secundo, qui concludendo seculo imminet in sublimitate divinitatis exsertæ: primum non intelligendo, secundum, quem manifestius prædicatum sperant, unum existimaverunt. Ne enim intelligerent pristinum, credituri, si intellexissent, et consecuturi salutem, si credidissent, meritum fuit delictum eorum. Ipsi legunt[20] ita scriptum, mulctatos se sapientia et intelligentia

[18] *penes vos* (i. e. *apud* v. c. 3.) must be joined not with *qui*, but with *præministraverunt*. "Those beings who supplied you beforehand with fables bearing a similarity to the truth, in order to its destruction, were fully aware of the coming events." The *dæmones* are here alluded to, the secret of whose foreknowledge is explained in c. 22. Compare c. 47. *Omnia adversus veritatem de ipso veritate constructa sunt, operantibus æmulationem istam spiritibus erroris.* Tertullian is asserting that not only the Jews, but even the heathens (*vos*) were fully aware by means of prophecy that Christ was to come; it may be remembered that Suetonius remarks on the *vetus* and *constans opinio* as prevailing *oriente toto*.

[19] Constr. *Duobus enim significatis, primo in humilitate qui expunctus est ...... secundo in sublimitate qui imminet ......* [ii] *non intelligendo primum ...... secundum quem* [*utpote*] ...... *sperant unum* (i. e. solum esse) *existimaverunt.* The words *concludendo seculo imminet,* I presume are equivalent to *qui jam præsto est, et qui finiet seculum* (see ad c. 48). On the argument see adv. Judæos ad fin. et adv. Marc. III. 7.

[20] Esai. vi. 10.

et oculorum et aurium fruge. Quem igitur solummodo hominem præsumpserant de humilitate, sequebatur uti magum æstimarent de potestate, cum ille verbo dæmonia de hominibus excuteret, cæcos reluminaret[21], leprosos purgaret, paralyticos restringeret, mortuos denique verbo redderet vitæ, elementa ipsa famularet, compescens procellas et freta ingrediens, ostendens se esse λόγον dei, id est, verbum illud primordiale primogenitum, virtute et ratione comitatum, et spiritu fultum, eundem, qui CAP. XXI.

[21] This passage affords a very good instance of the illustration which may be obtained from a comparison of S. Cyprian with Tertullian. The following is the paraphrase of the former (de Idol. Van. c. 3.) "Cum Christus Jesus verbo et vocis imperio dæmonia de hominibus excuteret, paralyticos restringeret, leprosos purgaret, illuminaret cæcos, claudis gressum daret, mortuos rursus animaret, cogeret sibi elementa famulari, servire ventos, maria obedire, inferos cedere, Judæi, qui illum crediderant hominem tantum de humilitate carnis et corporis, existimabant magum de licentia potestatis." The first expression to be noticed is *verbo*, which is very emphatic, and insisted upon at length by Arnobius (I. 25.), who mention it as a characteristic of the divine miracles, that they were performed instantaneously and *sine ullis rerum adminiculis*. Tertullian is close to Holy Scripture (S. Matt. viii. 16.) *et spiritus verbo ejiciebat*; S. Cyprian expounds it by *vocis imperio*, and Arnobius by *nominis sui possibilitate*; next, for *reluminaret*, a word which will scarcely be found elsewhere (*visum restituebat*, Lactant. Ep. D. I. 45). S. Cyprian has the far more usual term *illuminaret*, though on another subject (Ep. I.) he uses *luminare*, and on a third *oculare*, which is an analogous expression to his *animaret mortuos* above, and the *inauribat surdos* of Lactantius; thirdly, he retains *restringeret*, which, as opposite to *resolvo*, παραλύω, is very appropriately used, though in the same tract he employs *constringere* very differently, thus, *remissis quæ constrinxerant* (i. e. *dæmones*) *curasse videantur*, and fourthly, he explains by a full paraphrase the singular clause *elementa famularet* (v. c. 2.) so as to leave no doubt whatever of the meaning, and interprets both the words *humilitate* and *potestate*. *freta ingredi* is like *viam insistere*, &c. the accusative being not uncommon; *procellas* is simply *ventos*, as in Tacit. Ann. II. 23. *variis undique procellis*.

CAP. XXI.

verbo omnia et faceret et fecisset. Ad doctrinam vero ejus, qua revincebantur[22] magistri primoresque Judæorum, ita exasperabantur, maxime quod ad eum ingens multitudo deflecteret, ut postremo oblatum Pontio Pilato Syriam tunc ex parte Romana procuranti, violentia suffragiorum in crucem dedi sibi extorserint. Prædixerat et ipse ita facturos. Parum hoc[23], si non et prophetæ retro. Et tamen suffixus spiritum cum verbo sponte dimisit, prævento carnificis officio. Eodem momento dies, medium orbem signante sole[24], subducta est. Deliquium utique putaverunt, qui id quoque super Christo prædicatum non scierunt[25]; et tamen eum mundi casum relatum in archivis[26] vestris habetis.

[22] *revincebantur;* see c. 1. *oblatum.* c. 2.

[23] *Parum hoc,* &c. I think the meaning of this phrase (common enough in Tert.) is here: "And this simple fact perhaps would be not weighty enough in your eyes; however, there is the additional evidence of all the prophets long since." *prævento,* "being anticipated." S. Cyprian has taken the expression.

[24] *signante sole;* Seneca Cons. ad Marc. *Sol quotidiano cursu diei noctisque spatia signat.* Cic. Tuscul. I. 28. *lunam festorum signantem ac notantem dies. Subducta est,* is like *Eripiunt subito nubes cœlumque,* &c. Æn. I.

[25] [*id super Chr. præd.* sc. Amos viii. 9. Sic enim patres intelligebant. A.] Tertullian himself says, (adv. Jud. ad fin. cap. x.) *Nam quod in passione ejus accedit, ut media dies tenebresceret, Amos propheta annunciat, dicens,* &c.

[26] At the end of Gibbon's chap. 15, occurs the following note: "When Tertullian assures the Pagans that the mention of the prodigy is found *in arcanis* (not *archivis*) *vestris,* he probably appeals to the Sibylline verses which relate it exactly in the words of the Gospel." The reader may be informed that *archivis* was always the text till Havercamp (against whose perpetual stupidity Dr Ashton employs two thirds of his notes) introduced *arcanis* from a single favourite MS.; that the best editions still did read *archivis,* and that Rigaltius though he admitted *arcanis* in the text, explained it by *archivis* in the note; that Semler reads *archivis;* that Tertullian on two other occasions where the reading is un-

CAP. XXI.

Tunc Judæi detractum[27] et sepulcro conditum magna etiam militaris custodiæ diligentia circumsederunt, ne, quia prædixerat tertia die resurrecturum se a morte, discipuli furto amoliti cadaver fallerent suspectos. Sed ecce die tertia concussa repente terra, et mole revoluta, quæ obstruxerat sepulcrum, et custodia pavore disjecta[28], nullis apparentibus discipulis, nihil in sepulcro repertum est, præterquam exuviæ sepulti. Nihilominus tamen primores, quorum intererat et scelus divulgare, et populum vectigalem et famularem sibi a fide[29] revocare, surreptum a discipulis jactitaverunt. Nam nec ille se in vulgus eduxit, ne impii errore liberarentur, et ut fides, non mediocri præmio destinata, difficultate constaret. Cum discipulis autem quibusdam apud Galilæam Judææ regionem ad quadraginta dies egit, docens eos quæ docerent. Dehinc ordinatis eis ad officium prædicandi per orbem, circumfusa nube in cœlum est ereptus,

doubted uses *archiva*, and no where else *arcana*. According to the ordinary rules of classical criticism little doubt can exist but that the text is as above; and I so leave the magisterial decision of Gibbon and his subsequent considerate explanation to the reader's reflection.

[27] *detractum;* sc. de cruce. *fallerent suspectos* "should deceive the suspicious magistracy," *suspectos* for *suspicaces*, as elsewhere in this author.

[28] *disjecta;—dejicere* is the technical term for dislodging a military guard. Hor. Ep. II. 2. 30. Liv. 28. 7. Tac. Ann. 4. 25. or for overthrowing an adversary, as de Spect. 29. *impudicitiam a castitate dejectam,* and S. Cyprian, de Unit. Eccl. *subruendis ac dejiciendis Dei servis.* The *dis* here implies (as always in composition) the utter dispersion of the sentinels.

[29] *a fide;* sc. Christianâ. *Fides* and *fidelis* are perpetually so used by Tertullian and other writers. Lactantius (Ep. D. I. c. 66.) *fides maxime a nobis qui nomen fidei gerimus conservanda est. Fidelis* occasionally has a still more particular and emphatic signification.

CAP. XXI.

multo verius quam apud vos asseverare de Romulo Proculi solent. Ea omnia super Christo Pilatus, et ipse jam pro sua conscientia Christianus Cæsari tum Tiberio nuntiavit[30]. Sed[31] et Cæsares credidissent super Christo, si aut Cæsares non essent seculo necessarii, aut si et Christiani potuissent esse Cæsares. Discipuli quoque diffusi per

[30] *Nuntiavit*, i. e. by his official report, which he was of course compelled to make, v. c. 5. v. S. Matth. xxvii. 23, 24.

[31] *Sed et*, &c. "But the Emperors too would have believed in Christ, if they had not been indispensable to the times as Emperors, or if they could have been both believers and Emperors too." I must take the liberty of differing from Bishop Kaye in his apprehension of this passage, unless indeed I have misapprehended *him*. His Lordship writes (Eccl. Hist. p. 111.) that "Tertullian states that the account was sent to Tiberius by Pilate, who was in his conscience a Christian, and adds an expression which implies that worldly considerations alone prevented Tiberius from believing in Christ." I am naturally distrustful of my own opinion when opposed to such authority, but after careful consideration of the text, I cannot think that such circumstances are implied in the expression. It appears to me that Tertullian is meeting a probable question which his opponents might object. 'If all this be true, why was not Tiberius, or any other Cæsar, converted to the faith?' and his proleptic argument is: 'that the existence of the Cæsars in their imperial character was absolutely necessary to the times, (the *status sæculi, quies rerum*, &c.) that with such character Christian faith was essentially incompatible, and that therefore a superintending Providence ordered matters accordingly.' This at least is the best conclusion I can arrive at, which I think is supported by the language of the text, and is by no means foreign to the spirit of the author.

In Carew's translation of Barbeyrac's prefatory discourse to Puffendorf (which was afterwards amplified into the *Traitè de la Morale*) the following interpretation is given: "*They believed the Cæsars superior to Christ, as if the Cæsars were not necessary to the age, or as if the Cæsars should be Christians.*" (p.18. ed. fol. Lond. 1749). I cannot get the French original, to see whether Barbeyrac or his translator deserves the credit of this piece of scholarship, but the notes to this discourse contain other efforts of equal ingenuity. *Cæsari tum Tiberio* is like *Trajanum tunc Imperatorem* in c. 2.

orbem, ex præcepto magistri dei paruerunt[32], qui et ipsi a Judæis insequentibus multa perpessi, utique pro fiducia veritatis libenter, Romæ postremo per Neronis sævitiam, sanguinem Christianum seminaverunt. Sed monstrabimus vobis idoneos testes Christi, ipsos illos, quos adoratis[33]. Multum est, si eos adhibeam, ut credatis Christiani, propter quos non creditis Christianis. Interim hic est ordo nostræ institutionis, hunc edidimus et sectæ et nominis censum cum suo auctore. Nemo jam infamiam incutiat, nemo aliud existimet, quia nec fas[34] est ulli de sua religione mentiri. Ex eo enim, quod aliud a se coli dicit, quam colit, negat quod colit, et culturam et honorem in alterum transfert, et transferendo jam non colit quod negavit. Dicimus, et palam dicimus, et vobis torquentibus lacerati et cruenti vociferamur[35]: Deum colimus per Christum. Illum hominem putate, per eum et in eo se cognosci vult deus et coli. Ut autem Judæis respondeam, et ipsi deum per Moysen colere didicerunt; ut Græcis occurram, Orpheus

CAP. XXI.

[32] *paruerunt.* Dr Ashton would read *prædicaverunt,* which we have seen used absolutely before in this chapter, and which certainly improves the text. *insequentibus,* v. ad c. 2. *seminaverunt;* as in cap. ult. *semen est sanguis Christianorum.*

[33] *Multum est, si;* like *parum est, si,* and many other such expressions. "It is a great point, if I summon those very witnesses, to make you believe, through whose agency you now disbelieve;" *ut credatis Christiani,* i.e. *ut fiatis Chr. et credatis.*

[34] *quia nec fas est.* "it is not even possible." Tertullian means that no man can lie concerning his religion, as his very denial would make him cease *ipso facto* to be a votary of it.

[35] So c. 2. *vociferatur homo, Christianus sum!* and S. Cyprian ad Demetr. c. 3. *cum sponte confitear et clamem et crebris ac repetitis identidem vocibus Christianum me esse contester.*

CAP XXI.

Pieriæ, Musæus Athenis, Melampus Argis, Trophonius Bœotiæ initiationibus homines obligaverunt; ut ad vos quoque dominatores gentium adspiciam, homo fuit Pompilius Numa, qui Romanos operosissimis superstitionibus oneravit. [36] Licuerit et Christo commentari divinitatem rem propriam; non qui rupices[37] et adhuc feros homines multitudine tot numinum demerendorum attonitos efficiendo ad humanitatem temperaret, quod Numa; sed qui jam expolitos et ipsa urbanitate deceptos in agnitionem veritatis ocularet. Quærite ergo, si vera sit ista divinitas Christi. Si ea est, qua cognita ad bonum quis reformetur, sequitur, ut falsa renuntietur quævis alia contraria comperta; inprimis illa omni ratione, quæ delitescens sub nominibus et imaginibus mortuorum, quibusdam signis et miraculis et oraculis fidem divinitatis operatur[38].

XXII. Atque[1] adeo dicimus, esse substantias

[36] *Licuerit et Christo,* &c. 'It was at the option of Christ to compose a scheme in which his own divinity alone should be recognized, and this, not like Numa, by softening a barbarous herd into politeness, through astounding them with a host of deities to be propitiated, but by enlightening a people on the Truth who were already humanized, and indeed led astray by this very civilization.' The constr. seems to be '*Licuerit Christo commentari ... non [ille sc. talis] qui temperaret, sed qui ocularet.*' But the reading is probably *qui.* S. Cyprian has copied the last clause of the sentence de Idol. Van. c. 3.

[37] *rupices.* The allusion is to the almost proverbial line of Lucilius,

Varronum ac rupicum squarrosa incondita rostra;

where, by the way, I see no reason to interpret *Varro* otherwise than as a cognomen, so that the satire of the expression is like Juvenal, III. 238. *Druso, vitulisque marinis.*

[38] *fidem divinitatis operatur;* "works a belief in its own divinity."

XXII. [1] *Atque adeo.* This is a favourite expression with Tertullian, v. c. 4, c. 24, c. 25, c. 35. On the argument of this and the following chapters see the introduction.

quasdam spiritales; nec nomen novum est. Sciunt dæmonas philosophi, Socrate ipso ad dæmonii arbitrium exspectante[2]. Quidni? cum et ipsi dæmonium adhæsisse a pueritia dicatur dehortatorium. Plane, a bono. Dæmonas sciunt poetæ, etiam vulgus indoctum in usum maledicti frequentat, nam et Satanam, principem hujus mali generis, proinde de propria conscientia animæ eadem exsecramenti voce pronuntiat[3]. Angelos quoque etiam Plato non negavit; utriusque nominis testes vel magi adsunt. Sed quomodo de angelis quibusdam sua sponte corruptis corruptior gens dæmonum evaserit damnata a deo cum generis auctoribus, et cum eo quem diximus principe, apud litteras sanctas ordo cognoscitur[4]. Nunc de operatione eorum satis erit exponere. Operatio eorum est hominis eversio, sic malitia spiritalis a primordio auspicata

CAP. XXII.

I assert then that certain spiritual essences, called dæmons, exist, which indeed you recognize yourselves, and which are gifted with certain powers.

[2] *expectante* is probably to be taken absolutely, and *ad arbitrium* to be translated like *arbitrio,* either phrase being common enough. Yet I am by no means prepared to say that *expectare ad arbitrium* is an inadmissible construction; like *spectare ad oculos Domini, ad nutus heriles,* &c.

[3] The allusion is probably to the interjection *malum,* which Tertullian means to say is a natural and involuntary exclamation, and which refers to Satan as embodied evil, but there is considerable doubt about the soundness of the text.

[4] *ordo cognoscitur;* Constr. *Sed quomodo evaserit gens...... damnata ...... cum principe ......* [eorum] *ordo ap. lit. s. cognoscitur.* [apud literas sanctas. Hic velle videtur librum Enochi quem tanquam S. Scripturam admittere solet v. de Habit. Mulieb. c. 3. de Idol. c. 4, 15, et de cultu Fœm. 10. sed fortasse vult tantum Gen. 6. A.] *suâ sponte corruptis;* probably the meaning of Tertullian is simply that these angels brought all their punishment on themselves, though he may possibly imply that they were so captivated by the snares laid for them (Lactant. Ep. D. I. 27.) that they deliberately bartered their original incorrupt natures for earthly enjoyments. On the argument see ad c. 35.

CAP. XXII.

est in hominis exitium. Itaque corporibus quidem et valetudines infligunt et aliquos casus acerbos, animæ vero repentinos et extraordinarios per vim excessus[5]. Suppetit illis ad utramque substantiam hominis adeundam mira subtilitas et tenuitas sua. Multum spiritalibus viribus licet, ut invisibiles et insensibiles in effectu potius quam in actu suo appareant[6]. Si poma, si fruges nescio quod auræ latens vitium in flore præcipitat, in germine exanimat, in pubertate convulnerat, ac si cæca ratione tentatus aër pestilentes haustus suos offundit: eadem igitur obscuritate contagionis adspiratio dæmonum et angelorum mentis quoque corruptelas agit furoribus et amentiis fœdis, aut sævis libidinibus cum erroribus variis; quorum iste potissimus, quo deos istos captis et circumscriptis[7] hominis

[5] *animæ excessus;* I do not remember seeing *excedere* used exactly in this sense, but *excidere* is of common occurrence. e. g. Catull. LXVII. 24.

> Ut tibi nunc toto pectore solicitæ
> Sensibus ereptis mens excidit.......

excedere sæculo is often found for *mori,* as are *excedere* and *excessus* absolutely, see e. g. S. Cypr. de Mort. c. 3. It may be observed that *animæ* is a dative, after *infligunt; quidem* and *vero* being μὲν and δὲ. *utramque hominis substantiam* means the *corpus* and *anima; adire* here implies an idea of hostility, as elsewhere.

[6] *Multum sp. v. licet,* &c. Spiritual agencies have the great privilege of being discoverable rather in the effect they produce, than in the operations by which they produced it. *Si poma,* &c. Constr. *Si latens vitium præcipitat......exanimat......convulnerat ......si aer offundit; ergo......adspiratio agit.* See the conclusion of Lucretius in lib. 1. *Corporibus igitur cæcis natura gerit res,* and compare his theory of contagion in lib. VI. 1089. sqq. where the word *tentare* will be found more than once. Arnobius, I. 11. speaks of *morborum caussæ obscurissimæ;* and S. Cyprian de Idol. Van. c. 1. says *irrepentes etiam spiritus* (i. e. *pro spiritali sua natura*) *in corporibus, occulte mentes terrent,* &c.

[7] *circumscribere* to delude, (Juv. x. 222.) like *circumducere* (Plaut. Bacch. II. 3. 77.) and (in later Latin) *circumvenire.*

num mentibus commendat, ut et sibi pabula propria nidoris et sanguinis procuret simulacris et imaginibus oblata, et, quæ illis accuratior[8] pascua est, hominem a cogitatu veræ divinitatis avertant præstigiis falsæ divinationis. Quas et ipsas quomodo operentur, expediam. Omnis spiritus ales est. Hoc angeli et dæmones[9]. Igitur momento ubique sunt. Totus orbis illis locus unus est; quid ubique geratur, tam facile sciunt, quam enuntiant. Velocitas divinitas creditur, quia substantia ignoratur[10]. Sic et auctores interdum videri volunt eorum, quæ annuntiant; et sunt plane malorum nonnunquam, bonorum tamen nunquam. Dispositiones[11] etiam dei et tunc prophetis concionantibus exceperunt et nunc lectionibus resonantibus carpunt. Ita et hinc sumentes quasdam temporum sortes æmulantur di-

[8] *accuratior pascua*; a banquet in which they take even more delight, i.e. quæ iis magis curæ est; I cannot find another such example of the word.

[9] *hoc angeli et dæmones;* i. e. "*this*, viz. a winged being, both angels and dæmons are." We have seen this neuter similarly used by Tertullian before: *totus orbis locus unus est* is much such a phrase as *unum tempus est apud illas quod apud nos separari videtur.*

[10] *Velocitas*, &c. i. e. "Their facility of locomotion makes them received as gods, simply because their nature or essence is unknown." *Sic et auctores*, &c. Thus they wish even to be thought the authors of events of which they simply bring the information, and so indeed they are too, &c. (*et sunt plane malorum.*) On the use of *et* for *et profecto* see Kritz. ad Sall. Jug. c. 86, and to his examples add Tac. Hist. I. 72. *T. Vinii potentia defensus, prætexentis, "servatam ab eo filiam;" et haud dubie servaverat,* &c. *auctores* means 'originators, beings to whom as causes, these effects may be referred;' the word will be found so used in Virgil, and Suetonius relates of some Cæsar (I cannot lay my hand on the passage) that he recommended the substitution of the term *suasor* for *auctor* as applied to himself.

[11] *dispositiones Dei:* i. e. 'the course of things pre-ordained by God,' of which they thus inform themselves, and then retail the

CAP. XXII.

vinitatem, dum furantur divinationem. In oraculis autem quo ingenio ambiguitates temperent in eventus[12], sciunt Crœsi, sciunt Pyrrhi. Ceterum testudinem decoqui cum carnibus pecudis Pythius eo modo renuntiavit, quo supra diximus; momento apud Lydiam fuerat. Habent[13] de incolatu aëris et de vicinia siderum et de commercio nubium cœlestes sapere paraturas, ut et pluvias, quas jam sentiunt, repromittant. Venefici plane et circa curas valetudinum. Lædunt enim primo, dehinc remedia præcipiunt ad miraculum nova, sive contraria[14], post quæ desinunt lædere, et curasse creduntur. Quid ergo de ceteris ingeniis vel etiam viribus fallaciæ spiritalis edisseram? phantasmata Castorum, et aquam cribro gestatam, et navem cingulo promotam, et barbam tactu irrufatam[15];

information as prophecy. I have elsewhere remarked on the common use of *dispono* in this sense: compare especially c. 41. *admittite prius dispositiones ejus* (sc. Dei) *et non retorquebitis*. I would make *lectionibus resonantibus* the abl. abs.; the allusion being to the public reading of the Scriptures, so before c. 18, *sed et Judæi palam lectitant;* there is not much difference between *carpunt* and *excceperunt*. *quasdam temporum sortes*, i. e. tempora eventuum non nullorum. 'So, picking up from this quarter the knowledge of a few chance events, they make up a mock divinity for themselves by stealing prophecy.'

[12] Lactantius (Inst. Div. II. 15.) has copied the language as well as the argument, *solent responsa in ambiguos exitus temperare*. For the *testudo* see Herod. Clio, 47.

[13] *habent sapere*, so c. 38, *quem habemus odisse*, i. e. ἔχομεν. *de incolatu aeris*, i. e. propterea quod incolunt aera; *cœlestes paraturas;* i. e. quid in cœlo paretur. So Æn. v. 14. *Quid pater Neptune paras?* and Ge. I. 429. *paratura* is common in this author, though perhaps peculiar to him, it is pretty nearly equivalent to *apparatus*. v. ad c. 30.

[14] *nova sive contraria remedia* are remedies either entirely novel, or exactly contrary in their nature to those ordinarily adopted in like cases, so that the effect may seem more miraculous (*ad miraculum*.)

[15] *irrufatam;* So Tacitus speaks of *rutilatum crinem* (Hist. IV. 61). Apuleius, in the Apology,

CAP. XXII.

ut numina lapides crederentur, et deus verus non quæreretur.

XXIII. Porro si et magi phantasmata edunt, et jam defunctorum infamant animas; si pueros in eloquium oraculi[1] elidunt, si multa miracula circulatoriis præstigiis ludunt, si et somnia immittunt habentes semel invitatorum angelorum et dæmonum assistentem sibi potestatem, per quos et capræ et mensæ divinare consueverunt; quanto magis illa potestas de suo arbitrio et pro suo negotio studeat totis viribus operari, quod alienæ præstat negotiationi? Aut si eadem et angeli et dæmones operantur, quæ et dii vestri; ubi est ergo præcellentia divinitatis, quæ utique superior omni potestate credenda est? Non ergo dignius præsumetur, ipsos esse, qui se deos faciant, cum eadem edant, quæ faciant deos credi, quam pares angelis et dæmonibus deos esse? Locorum[2] differentia

These, openly, and in your presence we will compel to a full confession.

uses *purpurissare* and *splendidare* applied to the person, and Julius Firmicus (c. 21.) *incandidare*, and Tert. de Cor. Mil. I. has *russatus sanguine*. The allusion in the text is to the Ahenobarbi.

XXIII. [1] *In eloquium oraculi elidunt;* This is clearly the reading, I think, and not *eliciunt*, which would be applicable only to that species of necromancy already implied in the first clause of the sentence, whereas the repetition of *si* shews that Tertullian is alluding to a second magical practice, viz. that of investigating future events by the aid of a boy. Some very curious information on this subject may be collected from the Apology of Apuleius which I have spoken of in the introduction; at present I will only observe that if *elidunt* is to be taken strictly in its sense of *strangling* (by which indeed it is almost monopolized), the sense must be, that the boy is *sacrificed* as a victim to gain an oracular communication, otherwise, it means that some operation is performed on the boy which, for the time, gives him prophetic power; *in eloquium oraculi* would bear either of these interpretations.

[2] *Locorum differentia.* 'I presume that locality makes the difference, so that from the temples you conceive those beings to be

CAP. XXIII.

distinguit, opinor, ut a templis deos existimetis, quos alibi deos non dicitis; ut aliter dementire videatur, qui sacras turres pervolat, aliter qui tecta viciniæ transilit; et alia vis pronuntietur in eo qui genitalia vel lacertos, alia in eo qui sibi gulam prosecat. Compar exitus furoris, et una ratio est instigationis. Sed hactenus verba, jam hinc demonstratio rei ipsius, qua ostendemus unam esse utriusque nominis qualitatem. Edatur hic aliquis sub tribunalibus vestris, quem dæmone agi constet. Jussus a quolibet Christiano[8] loqui spiritus ille, tam se dæmonem confitebitur de vero, quam alibi deum de falso. Æque producatur ali-

gods whom elsewhere you deny to be such.' The previous argument is this—'The magi work miracles by the aid of demons; *a fortiori* can the dæmons themselves; still this does not destroy the existence of the gods, for possibly the dæmons and the gods have like power;—where then is the excellence or superiority of the god-hood? Is it not more natural to conclude that they are these identical gods (by their own creation), since we know that they work the very signs which are the credentials of the other gods? Is not this more probable than that they are the equals of the others.' The reasoning is then, I think, thus continued: Or do you mean to say that their dwellings alone make the distinction, and that a being which is a dæmon elsewhere, becomes a god by inhabiting a temple? unquestionably you so argue in other cases, inasmuch as a man who leaps from a sacred rock or makes mysterious incisions in his arms (alluding to the rock of Leucas and the priests of Cybele) is by no means reckoned such a madman as he who cuts his own throat, or jumps from the roof of his neighbour's house. The tone is sarcastic, of course, but changes to direct confutation in *compar exitus*, &c. Some for *existimetis* read *æstimetis*, the distinction is very well drawn by Kritz ad Sall. Catil. VIII. 2, in an edition which is one of the best specimens of Latin scholarship that have lately appeared.

[8] *a quolibet Christiano.* So Origen c. Cels. l. 7. ἰδιῶται τὸ τοιοῦτον πράττουσι. The expression is remarkable and important. *de vero;* "He will on this occasion confess himself a dæmon as truly, as he on others falsely declares himself a god." Lucret. I. 142. has *de plano* for *plane*. *profantur*, see c. 21.

CAP. XXIII.

quis ex iis, qui de deo pati existimantur[4], qui aris inhalantes numen de nidore concipiunt, qui ructando curvantur, qui anhelando profantur. Ista ipsa Virgo Cœlestis pluviarum pollicitatrix, iste ipse Æsculapius medicinarum demonstrator, alia die[5] morituris Socordio et Thanatio et Asclepiodoto vitæ sumministrator, nisi se dæmones confessi fuerint, Christiano mentiri non audentes, ibidem illius Christiani procacissimi sanguinem fundite. Quid isto opere manifestius? quid hac probatione fidelius? simplicitas veritatis in medio est; virtus illi sua assistit[6]; nihil suspicari licebit. Magia aut

[4] *æque producatur aliquis*, &c. The first class of possessed persons are the simple dæmoniacs (*quos dæmone agi constat*) about whose state there is no doubt; a second class is here alluded to, viz. of those who are under the temporary influence of some agency which was considered as imparting a spirit of prophecy, such for instance as the steam from certain sacrifices, &c. *inhalantes* seems to take a dative precisely like *inhiantes* and to be used in the same sense; *concipere numen* is a common phrase like the *concepit furias* of Dido, or *concipere fata*, Luc. I. 630; and the two subsequent clauses allude to the contortions of body and affections of the lungs produced by inhaling these gases. The *Virgo Cœlestis* is Juno, the tutelar deity of Carthage; I do not think any contempt is implied here in the use of *iste*, but Arnobius uses this pronoun perpetually in such a sense; he even, in addressing a heathen school, says *Et tamen, O isti! quid facitis*, &c.

[5] [alia, pro altera, i. e. proxima, τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρα. Sic Spartian. in Anton. Pio. c. 12. 'alia die febre coreptus est,' sc. proxime sequente. Ita sæpe Plautus. Sic Capitol. in Maximin. c. 17. 'prima die......alia die.' et Trebell. in Mario tyranno 'una die factus est Imperator, alia die visus est imperare, tertia interemptus est.' A.]

[6] *simplicitas veritatis*, &c. I hardly know whether I rightly conceive all that Tertullian means to say in this sentence; but if I do so it is this: "Truth in all its naked simplicity (*nuda sinceritus*) is before your eyes (*in medio*); that virtue which is the peculiar attribute and characteristic of truth (*sua*) viz. simplicity, attends it there," or has the *virtus sua* any reference to the *magna est veritas*?

CAP. XXIII.

aliqua ejusmodi fallacia fieri dicetis, si[7] oculi vestri et aures permiserint vobis. Quid autem injici potest adversus id, quod ostenditur nuda sinceritate? Si altera parte[8] vere dei sunt, cur sese dæmonia mentiuntur? an ut nobis obsequantur? Jam ergo subjecta est Christianis divinitas vestra; nec utique divinitas deputanda est, quæ subdita est homini, et si quid ad dedecus facit, æmulis suis. Si altera parte dæmones sunt vel angeli, cur se alibi pro diis agere respondent? Nam sicut illi, qui dii habentur[9], dæmones se dicere noluissent, si vere dii essent, scilicet ne de majestate se deponerent: ita et isti, quos directo dæmones nostis, non auderent alibi pro diis agere, si aliqui omnino dii essent, quorum nominibus utuntur; vererentur

[7] *dicetis si*, i. e. *licebit vobis dicere ...... si permiserint......* [verum non permittent.] *quid autem injici*, &c. others read here *inniti*, which I cannot well comprehend, unless they make it passive; *injici* is like *injeci scrupulum homini*.

[8] *altera parte...... altera parte* —"on the one hand—on the other hand." The reasoning is, "If they are gods why do they degrade themselves into dæmons? If dæmons, how do they dare exalt themselves into gods? unless indeed there are no gods to avenge this presumption." *subjecta est christianis divinitas vestra;* the expression *divinitas vestra* is not an easy one to render into English, though its meaning will very probably caught by the reader at first sight. It is not of course, 'your own divinity,' neither is it precisely equivalent to *Dii vestri*, but it means 'godship, according to your ideas of theology,' *divinitas* being that which constitutes the *Deus*, (compare note on c. 46) and *vestra* the same as *quam tenetis* (*tenere* being applied as to a school of philosophy) below. *facit ad dedecus* is like *facit ad caussam* in c. 39.

[9] *qui dii habentur;* the change of tone may be remarked here; "for," says Tertullian, "just as they, whose existence as gods you *believe*, would, &c. so would they of whose existence as dæmons you are *certain*, &c." a little below *aliqui* is equivalent to *vel alicujus generis*, and the young student should be careful not to translate the passage as if *utuntur* were *uterentur*.

CAP. XXIII.

enim abuti majestate superiorum sine dubio et timendorum. Adeo nulla est divinitas ista quam tenetis, quia si esset, neque a dæmoniis affectaretur, neque a diis negaretur. Cum ergo utraque pars concurrit in confessionem, deos esse negans, agnoscite unum genus esse, id est dæmonas. Verum utrobique jam deos quærite[10]; quos enim præsumpseratis, dæmonas esse cognoscitis. Eadem vero opera nostra ab eisdem diis vestris non tantum hoc detegentibus, quod neque ipsi dii sint neque ulli alii[11], etiam illud in continenti cognoscitis, qui sit vere deus, et an ille, et an unicus, quem Christiani profitemur, et an ita credendus colendusque, ut fides, ut disciplina disposita est Christianorum. Dicent ibidem quis ille Christus cum sua fabula[12]; si homo communis conditionis, si magus, si post mortem de sepulcro a discipulis surreptus, si nunc denique penes inferos, si non in

[10] *verum utrobique*, &c. The argument of this and the preceding sentence is as follows: Since then either hypothesis (*utraque pars*) tends similarly towards the same admission, (*in confessionum*) inasmuch as either denies the existence of the gods, you must acknowledge that one, and one only, species of beings of this kind exists, viz. dæmons. And on either presumption, you must now look out some fresh gods for yourselves, since those whom you formerly believed in as such, are confessedly of a different essence.

[11] *quod neque ipsi*, &c. i. e. "that they are neither your own identical gods, not indeed gods of any other nature;" *in continenti* means "continuously, by the same proof."

[12] *Dicent ibidem;* They will also tell you on the same occasion whether, &c. The *si* recurring so frequently in this sentence is equivalent to *utrum-necne*. So c. 29. *constet igitur, si isti......impertiri possunt*, and such a sense it not unfrequently has in this Latin, but the passage ad Martyres, c. 4. *si tanti vitrum, quanti margaritum* is erroneously quoted as an instance of its use as a direct interrogative; the meaning being "*if* glass (i. e. sufferings for human glory) is so valuable, what is the worth of pearl (i. e. sufferings for Christ's sake.)"

CAP. XXIII.

cœlis potius, et inde venturus cum totius mundi motu, cum horrore orbis, cum planctu omnium, sed non Christianorum, ut dei virtus et dei spiritus et sermo et sapientia et ratio et dei filius. Quodcunque ridetis, rideant[13] et illi vobiscum; negent Christum omnem ab ævo animam restituto corpore judicaturum. Dicant hoc[14] pro tribunali, si forte, Minoën et Radamanthum secundum consensum Platonis et poetarum esse sortitos; suæ saltem ignominiæ et damnationis notam refutent: renuant se immundos spiritus esse, quod vel ex pabulis eorum sanguine et fumo et putidis rogis pecorum et impuratissimis linguis ipsorum vatum intelligi debuit; renuant ob malitiam prædamnatos[15] se in eundem judicii diem cum omnibus cultoribus et operatoribus suis. Atqui omnis hæc nostra in illos dominatio et postestas de nominatione Christi valet[16], et de commemoratione eorum, quæ sibi a deo per arbitrum Christum imminentia exspectant. Christum timentes in deo, et deum in Christo, subjiciuntur servis dei et Christi. Ita de contactu deque afflatu nostro, contemplatione et repræsentatione ignis illius correpti, etiam de corporibus

[13] *rideant et illis,* i. e. "let us see whether they will join your ridicule." *rideant, negent,* &c. are used like the imperatives in Hor. Sat. II. 2. 15. Juv. XIII. 161. *ab ævo* a little further is synonymous with *ab initio, a primordio* and the like phrases, and corresponds to the *per ævum* of Lucretius.

[14] *Dicant hoc,* &c. Constr. *Dicant ...... Minoen et Rhadamanthum ...... secundum consensum......sortitos esse hoc*—sc. *animarum judicium.*

[15] *prædamnatos.* Cf. S. Matth. viii. 29. Ep. S. Petri ii. 2. 4. *operatoribus* may be taken in the sacrificial sense common to *facio* and *operor.*

[16] *valet potestas de.* "The validity of our power is derived from," &c. S. Matth. vii. 22. *in nomine tuo dæmonia ejecimus.*

nostro imperio excedunt inviti et dolentes, et vobis præsentibus erubescentes[17]. Credite illis, cum verum de se loquuntur, qui mentientibus creditis. Nemo ad suum dedecus mentitur, quin potius ad honorem. Magis fides prona est adversus semetipsos confitentes[18], quam pro semetipsis negantes[19]. Hæc denique testimonia deorum vestorum Christianos facere consueverunt, quia plurimum illis credendo Christo domino credimus Ipsi litterarum nostrarum fidem accendunt, ipsi spei nostræ fidentiam ædificant. At colitis illos, quod sciam,

[17] *erubescentes vobis præsentibus;* I have spoken of the usual constructions of this word in Tertullian, ad c. 9.

[18] *fides prona est adversus semetipsos,* &c. others read "*in* adversus semetipsos confitentes," which makes it more clear. If the above text is correct, the construction and argument are as follow: *Magis fides prona est erga eos qui fatentur se, quam eos qui negant se, malos esse.* Thus *adversus* is simply *erga* as in Apuleius, who in one passage (de Deo Socr. 672) *communio adversus Deos* even uses it for *cum;* and it governs both participles. *confiteri* and *negare* are both taken absolutely as in c. 2.; compare too Lactantius de M. P. 49. *tormentis adactus, fatebatur.* I do not recollect an instance of the addition of the pronoun, but I see no objection to it. And yet *pro semetipsis* seems to be meant to answer *adversus semetipsos.*

[19] *Hæc denique testimonia,* &c. The thread of the argument to the conclusion of the chapter seems to be as follows: "To conclude, it is this very evidence given by your own gods which has been most effectual in procuring converts to christianity, inasmuch as in the majority of cases (*plurimum*) it has been through believing testimony of this kind that we have come to be believers in Christ. *They* involuntarily strengthen *us.* But you propitiate them with sacrifices (*pabulis eorum*), and even sacrifices of Christian victims. Necessarily therefore they would not lose such serviceable votaries if they could help it; besides which, converts from you become, as Christians (*quandoque Christiani*) their aggressors, and thus they not only lose a slave but get another determined enemy. From all which you may collect, they would not make such confessions if they were not absolutely true, and extorted from them."

CAP. XXIII.

etiam de sanguine Christianorum. Nollent itaque vos tam fructuosos, tam officiosos sibi amittere, vel ne a vobis quandoque Christianis fugentur, si illis sub Christiano, volente vobis veritatem probare, mentiri liceret.

And this confession will clear us from the charge of impiety: besides, all worship should be essentially voluntary.

XXIV. Omnis ista confessio illorum, qua se deos negant esse, quaque non alium deum respondent præter unum, cui nos mancipamur, satis idonea est ad depellendum crimen læsæ maxime Romanæ religionis. Si enim non sunt dei pro certo, nec religio pro certo est; si religio non est, quia nec dei pro certo, nec nos pro certo rei sumus læsæ religionis. At e contrario in vos exprobratio resultabit[1], qui mendacium colentes, veram religionem veri dei non modo negligendo, quin insuper expugnando, in verum[2] committitis crimen veræ irreligiositatis. Nunc, ut[3] constaret illos deos esse, nonne conceditis de æstimatione communi aliquem esse sublimiorem et potentiorem velut principem mundi, perfectæ potentiæ et majestatis? Nam et sic plerique disponunt divinitatem[4], ut imperium summæ dominationis esse penes unum, officia ejus

XXIV. [1] *resultabit.* Compare *retorquere* and *referentere*, which have before occurred.

[2] *in verum;* I prefer considering this as equivalent to *in veritatem,* to repeating *Deum* from above.

[3] *ut constaret;* i. e. *etiamsi* Apul. (Apol. 514) *ut tædium posset perpeti, tamen non,* &c. but the phrase is good. v. Juv. VIII. 272. Liv. 38. 17. On the argument compare a remarkable passage in Apuleius (Apol. 508.) *Idem Maximus optime intelligit, ut de nomine etiam vobis respondeam, quisnam sit ille, non a me primo, sed a Platone nuncupatus βασιλεύς, totius rerum naturæ caussa, et ratio,* &c.

[4] *disponunt divinitatem;* "so distribute and arrange the godship in their theory"—*officia ejus;* "its various executive departments."

penes multos velint; ut Plato[5] Jovem magnum in cœlo comitatum exercitu describit deorum pariter et dæmonum. Itaque oportere et procurantes et præfectos et præsides pariter suspici[6]. Et[7] tamen quod facinus admittit, qui magis ad Cæsarem promerendum et operam et spem suam transfert, nec appellationem dei ita ut imperatoris in alio quam principe confitetur, cum capitale esse judicetur alium præter Cæsarem et dicere et audire? Colat alius[8] deum, alius Jovem, alius ad cœlum

CAP. XXIV.

[5] Phædr. c. 56. ed. Bekk. *ὁ μὲν δὴ μεγας ἡγεμὼν ἐν οὐρανῷ Ζεύς ἐλαύνων πτηνὸν ἅρμα πρωτος πορευεται διακοσμῶν πάντα καὶ ἐπιμελούμενος· τῷ δ' ἕπεται στρατιὰ θεῶν τε καὶ δαιμόνων.* Compare too Arnobius, l. III. ad fin. *Nam quid de ipso dicemus Jove, quem solem esse dictitavere sapientes, agitantem pinnatos currus, turba consequente divorum?* Tertullian is preparing an argument of this kind, that since they admit that there is a superior power, under whom are subordinate officers (*procurantes ac præfectos*), and to all of whom they pay honour, that possibly some individuals may rather choose to neglect the latter for the sake of concentrating their worship in the former.

[6] *suspicere;* "to look up to, or worship." Cicero opposes it *despicere* (Off. II. 10) *itaque eos viros suspiciunt in quibus existimant se perspicere virtutes, despiciunt autem eos in quibus nihil virtutis putant.* Cf. Hor. Epist. I. 6. 18. Eurip. Hec. 355. *παρθένοις ἀπόβλεπτος μέτα.* So presently, c. 32. *judicium dei suspicimus in imperatoribus*, and Arnobius, (VII. 11.) *efficiturque ut videatur magnus quem suspectio minoris extulerit.*

[7] The argument is continued from the previous remarks: "Your own schemes make an assembly of gods, with a president—Now what possible crime can he be held to commit who confines his exertions and expectations to the propitiation of Cæsar especially, (i. e. rather than any of the subordinates) and refuses to admit the title of god, as that of emperor, in any other than the head, particularly since amongst yourselves it is a capital crime to speak of any one, or listen to any one spoken of, as Cæsar, except Cæsar himself. In the expression *ad Cæsarem promerendum* the word *Cæsar* is used simply for the chief or head.

[8] *colat alius Deum,* &c. Either this is the commencement of a fresh argument, or it is connected with the preceding paragraph in

CAP. XXIV.

supplices manus tendat, alius ad aram Fidei, alius, si hoc putatis[9], nubes numeret orans, alius lacunaria, alius suam animam deo suo voveat, alius hirci. Videte enim ne et hoc ad irreligiositatis elogium concurrat[10], adimere libertatem religionis et interdicere optionem divinitatis, ut non liceat mihi colere quem velim, sed cogar colere quem nolim. Nemo se ab invito coli volet, ne homo quidem; atque adeo et Ægyptiis permissa est tam vanæ superstitionis potestas, avibus et bestiis consecrandis, et capite damnandis, qui aliquem hujusmodi deum occiderit. Unicuique etiam provinciæ et civitati suus deus est, ut Syriæ Atargatis, ut Arabiæ Dusares, ut Noricis Belenus, ut Africæ Cœlestis, ut Mauritaniæ Reguli sui. Romanas, ut opinor, provincias edidi, nec tamen Romanos deos earum, quia Romæ non magis coluntur, quam qui per ipsam quoque Italiam municipali consecratione censentur: Casiniensium Delventinus, Narniensium Visidianus, Æsculanorum Ancharia, Volsiniensium Nortia[11], Ocriculanorum Valentia, Su-

this way, "Why should not any man be permitted then to worship the chief god alone? or rather, why should not every man be left to his own will in matters of religion, whatever he chooses to pay honour to; true religion must in its essence be voluntary, &c.

[9] *si hoc putatis*, i. e. "if you choose so to interpret a prayer addressed to heaven, as to fancy the petitioner is only counting the clouds." So Juvenal of the Jews. *Nil præter nubes et cœli numen adorant.* As *lacunaria* are really the compartments in a system of pannelling on the cieling, *numeret* may be strictly supplied from the other clause, or (which is more probable) it may be taken simply as *suspiciat*.

[10] *ad irreligiositatis elogium concurrat;* 'go towards proving the charge of irreligion.' On the argument see ad Scap. c. 2. Lactant. I. D. v. 20.

[11] *Volsiniensium Nortia.* v. ad

trinorum Hostia, Faliscorum in honorem patris Curis, unde accepit cognomen, Juno. Sed nos soli arcemur a religionis proprietate[12]. Lædimus Romanos nec Romani habemur, quia non Romanorum deum colimus. Bene quod omnium deus est, cujus, velimus aut nolimus, omnes sumus. Sed apud vos quodvis[13] colere jus est, præter verum deum, quasi non hic magis omnium sit deus, cujus omnes sumus.

CAP. XXIV.

XXV. Satis mihi quidem videor probasse de falsa et vera divinitate, cum demonstravi, quemadmodum probatio consistat, non modo disputationibus, nec argumentationibus, sed ipsorum etiam testimoniis, quos deos creditis, ut nihil jam ad hanc caussam sit retractandum[1]. Quoniam tamen Romani nominis proprie[2] mentio occurrit, non omittam

I may here remark on your assertion that through piety to these Gods the Romans acquired their present power.

Juv. x. 74. *in honorem patris Curis;* this passage is probably corrupt.

[12] *proprietas.* This word, like *proprius,* admits of various significations. Livy employs it, (38. 17.) *Non tantum semina ad servandam indolem valent, quantum terræ proprietas cœlique sub quo aluntur, mutat.* It is used by Pliny repeatedly to express the *property* peculiar to any herb or mineral. Apuleius applies it to the *species* of an animal or its characteristics. (Apol. 471) *nec apud veteres philosophos proprietatem ejus piscis reperio, quanquam sit omnium rarissima, et hercule memoranda,* (as indeed from its subsequent description it appears to have been.) But, from the context, it seems in this passage to be (like so many of Tertullian's terms) forensic, and the sense is: "We alone of all people are forbidden to possess and keep a religion exclusively to ourselves."

[13] *quodvis;* this neuter is perpetually used without any implication of contempt, but I think here that it alludes to the stocks and stones which men were permitted to adore, though the worship of the true God was interdicted.

XXV. [1] *Ut nihil jam,* &c.; "so that there is no further need of argument as regards this plea," for *retractare* see ad c. 3.

[2] *proprie mentio occurrit;* "as however the Romans have been particularly mentioned," i. e. at the end of the last chapter. *con-*

CAP. XXV.

congressionem, quam provocat illa præsumptio dicentium Romanos pro merito religiositatis diligentissimæ in tantum sublimitatis elatos, ut orbem occuparint, et adeo[3] deos esse, ut præter ceteros floreant, qui illis officium præter ceteros faciant. Scilicet ista merces Romanis a diis pro gratia expensa est: Sterculius, et Mutunus, et Larentina, provexit imperium. Peregrinos enim[4] deos non putem extraneæ genti magis fautum voluisse quam suæ, et patrium solum, in quo nati, adulti, nobilitati, sepultique sunt, transfretanis dedisse. Viderit Cybele, si urbem Romanam ut memoriam Trojani generis adamavit, vernaculi sui scilicet ad-

gressionem; 'an engagement with you on this point,' like *concurram,* c. 4.

[3] *adeo deos esse, ut,* &c. I do not imagine *adeo......ut* to be used for *propterea......quia,* but I think the force of *adeo* to be *in tantum* or *usque adeo,* i. e. "Not only that the gods exist, but they exist to such good purpose that," &c. There is a somewhat similar expression in Min. Fel. c. 2. *cujus* (i. e. Dei Judæorum) *adeo nulla vis nec potestas est ut sit Romanis hominibus* (this last word is emphatic) *cum sua sibi natione captivus.* A little further down, *provexit imperium* is like *proferet imperium,* Æn. VI. 796.

[4] *Enim;* "I mention," says Tertullian, "these Roman deities, *for* as to foreign gods," &c.—In the construction of this sentence the *et* couples *voluisse* and *dedisse,* and both must be connected closely with the negative. *viderit Cybele;* the expression is that explained ad c. 16, and the exception of course ironical: "Cybele is not a case in point, for, though a foreign deity, she doubtless came over from a foresight of the future; only it is a little unfortunate that she made such a mistake the other day," &c. Dr Ashton suggests *ob memoriam* for *ut,* but I prefer the present text, see ad c. 18. *prospexit transire* means, "provided for herself by this migration." This is not a passage of which the bearing is immediately obvious, and especial care must be taken not to overlook the continuance of the irony throughout the whole of the sentence *itaque majestatis,* &c. It seems that the priest of Cybele (*archigallus ille*) had offered up prayers for the emperor M. Aurelius some days after his death, which occurred at a distance, and this gives Tertullian an opportunity of ridiculing the divinity of the goddess.

CAP. XXV.

versus Achivorum arma protecti, si ad ultores transire prospexit, quos sciebat Græciam Phrygiæ debellatricem subacturos. Itaque majestatis suæ in urbem collatæ grande documentum nostræ etiam ætati proposuit, cum Marco Aurelio apud Sirmium reipublicæ exempto, die decimo sexto Kalendarum Aprilium, Archigallus ille sanctissimus, die nono Kalend. earundem, quo sanguinem impurum, lacertos quoque castrando libabat, pro salute imperatoris Marci jam intercepti solita æque imperia mandavit[5]. O nuntios tardos, o somniculosa diplomata, quorum vitio excessum imperatoris non ante Cybele cognovit, ne deam talem riderent Christiani. Sed non statim et Jupiter Cretam suam Romanis fascibus concuti sineret, oblitus antrum[6] illud Idæum, et æra Corybantia, et jucundissimum illic nutricis suæ odorem. Nonne omni Capitolio tumulum illum suum præposuisset, ut ea potius orbi terra præcelleret, quæ cineres Jovis texit? Vellet Juno Punicam urbem posthabita Samo dilectam ab Æneadarum utique[7] genere deleri? Quod si

[5] [*Solita æque imperia mandavit;* votis pro more factis prosperum mortuo æque ac antea viventi imperium ominabatur, et Cybeles nomine spondebat. A.] The expression *excessus* for *mors* has been remarked on in c. 22.

[6] *statim* is used like *temere. oblitus antrum; obliviscor* is constantly found with an accusative in early writers; the expression, together with several others of this chapter, occurs at the conclusion of the second book ad Nationes, but all that book is so mutilated that it would be unintelligible but for this Apology.

[7] *utique,* sc. ut sibi inimicissimo. Prudentius, c. Symmach. II. 495.

Concessit et ipsa
Juno suos Phrygiis servire nepotibus Afros;
Et, quam subjectis dominam Dea gentibus esse
Si qui fata sinant, jam tum tenditque fovetque,
Jussit Romuleis addictam vivere frænis.

CAP. XXV.

Hic illius arma,
Hic currus fuit, hoc regnum dea gentibus esse,
Si qua fata sinant, jam tum tenditque fovetque:

Misera illa conjunx Jovis et soror adversus fata non valuit plane:

Fato stat Jupiter ipse.

Nec tantum tamen honoris Romani dicaverunt fatis dedentibus sibi Carthaginem adversus destinatum votumque Junonis, quantum prostitutissimæ lupæ Larentinæ. Plures deos vestros regnasse certum est[8]. Igitur si conferendi imperii tenent potestatem, cum ipsi regnarent, a quibus acceperant eam gratiam? quem coluerat Saturnus et Jupiter? aliquem opinor Sterculium, [sed Romæ postea] cum indigenis suis. Etiam si qui non regnarunt, tamen regnabatur ab aliis nondum cultoribus suis, ut qui nondum dii habebantur. Ergo aliorum est regnum dare, quia regnabatur multo ante quam isti dii inciderentur. Sed quam vanum est fastigium[9] Romani nominis religiositatis meritis deputare, cum

[8] There is here a little change in the signification of the word *regnum*, which in one part of the argument is meant to imply the *regalis potestas* of a petty king, and in another the *imperium in orbem* of the Romans. "Confessedly, many of your deities once reigned on earth; or, if they did not, other rulers did who were not worshippers of *them; therefore*, the power of conferring kingdoms is anterior to them, i. e. your present gods, and must be looked for elsewhere." *inciderentur* must refer to the inscriptions on their statues, it can hardly be used of the sculpture of an image, v. c. 50, and Juv. VIII. 69.

....aliquid da
Quod possim titulis incidere præter honores.

[9] *fastigium deputare meritis*, i. e. "to set down the grandeur of the Roman name to the account of their pious merits."

CAP. XXV.

post imperium sive adhuc regnum religio profecerit. Nam[10] etsi a Numa concepta est curiositas superstitiosa, nondum tamen aut simulacris aut templis res divina apud Romanos constabat; frugi religio et pauperes ritus, et nulla Capitolia certantia cœlo, sed temeraria de cespite altaria, et vasa adhuc Samia, et nidor ex illis, et deus ipse nusquam. Nondum enim tunc ingenia[11] Græcorum atque Tuscorum fingendis simulacris urbem inundaverant. Ergo non ante religiosi Romani, quam

[10] *Nam etsi*, &c. It can scarcely be considered fair reasoning to argue that piety cannot exist without riches, or that the devotion of a people is less earnest or acceptable when proffered with humble ceremonies. In fact, every reader will recollect the peculiar fondness with which all Roman moralists, both in prose and verse, during the luxurious days of the state, recur to the simplicity and fervour which they assert was characteristic of ancient times, and to the poverty and piety which then alike prevailed; and the very expressions of the text, *vasa Samia* and *de cespite altaria* are employed in laudatory descriptions of antiquity, where the satisfaction of the gods at these humble offerings is pointedly detailed. The next argument too, on the captured deities, may seem ungraciously urged when it is recollected what singular pains the Romans took in their sieges about the *Deorum evocatio*, with this very view, as Servius says, (ad Æn. II. 351.) *propter vitanda sacrilegia*. See the form of the excantation in Macrobius, (Satur. III. 9.) who speaks of it as *ex occultissimis sacris*. Compare, too, Pliny (H. N. XXVIII. 4.) and Arnobius (III. 30.) who observes, *solere Romanos Deos omnes urbium superatarum partim privatim per familias spargere, partim publice consecrare*. But the truth is, that these circumstances were so generally urged by the Pagans and received so seeming a corroboration from the simultaneous decline of their religion and prosperity, that Tertullian could not overlook the point, the importance of which is evident also from the manner in which S. Cyprian and S. Augustine afterwards insist on it, and as they use very much the reasoning of this Apology, we may infer that it was in some way efficacious. Compare Prudentius in the passage from which I have quoted above.

[11] *ingenia fingendis simulacris* must be taken closely together. Compare the observations at the commencement of c. 15.

CAP. XXV. magni; ideoque non ob hoc magni, quia religiosi. Atqui quomodo ob religionem magni, quibus magnitudo de irreligiositate provenit! Ni fallor enim, omne regnum vel imperium bellis quæritur et victoriis propagatur. Porro bella et victoriæ captis et eversis plurimum urbibus constant[12]. Id negotium sine deorum injuria non est. Eædem strages mœnium et templorum, pares cædes civium et sacerdotum, nec dissimiles rapinæ sacrarum divitiarum et profanarum. Tot igitur sacrilegia Romanorum, quot tropæa; tot de diis, quot de gentibus triumphi; tot manubiæ, quot manent adhuc simulacra captivorum deorum. Et ab hostibus ergo suis sustinent[13] adorari, et illis imperium sine fine decernunt, quorum magis injurias quam adolationes[14] remunerasse debuerant. Sed qui nihil sentiunt, tam impune læduntur, quam frustra coluntur. Certe non potest fidei convenire, ut religionis meritis excrevisse videantur, qui, ut suggessimus, religionem aut lædendo creverunt, aut crescendo læserunt[15]. Etiam illi, quorum regna conflata sunt in imperii Romani summam, cum ea amitterent, sine religionibus non fuerunt.

Ad Nat. II. 17.

[12] *bella et victoriæ constant;* "the materials, or events, of war are, &c.;" so above, *res divina simulacris constabat.*

[13] *sustinent,* v. ad c. 8. the nominative is *Dei captivi. imperium sine fine,* the words are probably allusive to Æn. I. 279, like other expressions in the chapter.

[14] *adolatio;* this is almost a singular instance of the occurrence of this word, and here the reading is by no means certain; but *adolo* is said to be connected with an old form *olo* equivalent to *colo,* which gives the noun in the text.

[15] *etiam illi,* &c. the argument is this: Besides, the nations conquered by the Romans were also religious in their way, and therefore deserved as well at the hands of the gods, so that one case destroys the other.

CAP. XXVI.

Are not the affairs of this world rather in the hands of the one God, who orders all?

XXVI. Videte igitur, ne ille regna dispenset, cujus est et orbis qui regnatur[1], et homo ipse qui regnat; ne ille vices[2] dominationum ipsis temporibus in seculo ordinarit, qui ante omne tempus fuit et seculum[3], corpus temporum, fecit; ne ille civitates extollat aut deprimat, sub quo fuit aliquando sine civitatibus genus hominum. Quid erratis? prior est quibusdam diis suis silvestris[4] Roma; ante regnavit, quam tantum ambitum Capitolii[5] exstrueret. Regnaverunt et Babylonii ante

XXVI. [1] *orbis qui regnatur;* This passive form occurs in Virgil (Æn. VI. 793.) and Horace (Car. III. 29, 27.)

[2] *Vices dominationum* are the changes of empires, *ipsis temporibus* seems to be for *cum ipsis temp.* (αὐτοῖς τοῖς χρόνοις) and *in seculo* like *in seculum* or *in seculo futuras.* "Whether he did not ordain all changes of empires, with the periods of their occurrence, from the first to the last."

[3] *sæculum;* This word is used with various significations in ecclesiastical writers; in the text it is the natural life, as it were, of the universe, the pre-ordained course of time of which the termination is the end of the world, and it is called *corpus temporum* as embracing what Lucretius would term the *eventa temporis* (I. 460. sqq.); all events whatever and their periods, and thus representing their aggregate or sum. In this way Lactantius (Ep. D. I. c. 70.) speaks *de fine sæculi et conclusione temporum* as synonymous expressions, and we shall presently see *clausulam sæculi* (c. 32.) and *finem sæculi* (c. 41.) used for *mundi finem;* and so in the Vulgate, *consummatio sæculi.* At other times *sæculum* is used simply for a century or a certain period of time, as Lucan says (I. 73.) *Sæcula tot mundi suprema coegerit hora.* I do not think it will ever be found equivalent to *ævum* (as explained ad c. 48.) like *vives in ævum,* &c. excepting in the well known formula *in sæcula sæculorum,* but it will very frequently be met with for *mundus* or *vita hæc* as opposed to *vita æterna,* in which sense *sæcularis* occurs also.

[4] *Silvestris Roma.* Æn. VIII. 346.

> . . . ad Capitolia ducit
> Aurea nunc, olim sylvestribus horrida dumis.

Compare the whole of the passage.

[5] *tantum ambitum Capitolii*—this was built first by Tarquinius Priscus, secondly by L. Sulla, and thirdly by Domitian; from the text Tertullian seems to be alluding to the early enclosure by Tarquinius.

CAP. XXVI.

pontifices, et Medi ante quindecemviros, et Ægyptii ante Salios, et Assyrii ante Lupercos, et Amazones ante virgines Vestales. Postremo si Romanæ religiones regna præstant, nunquam retro Judæa regnasset despectrix communium istarum divinitatum[6], cujus et deum victimis, et templum donis, et gentem fœderibus aliquamdiu Romani honorastis[7], nunquam dominaturi ejus, si non ultimo deliquisset in Christum.

It is easy though to recognize what agency is at work to delude you.

XXVII. Satis hæc adversus intentionem[1] læsæ divinitatis, quo non videamur lædere eam, quam ostendimus non esse. Igitur provocati ad sacrificandum obstruimus[2] gradum pro fide conscientiæ nostræ, qua certi sumus, ad quos ista perveniant officia sub imaginum prostitutione et humanorum nominum consecratione. Sed quidam dementiam existimant, quod cum possimus[3] et sa-

[6] *istarum divinitatum*, see ad c. 23. for the expression *divinitas*.

[7] Josephus Ant. Jud. XIV. c. 16, relates the *fœdus* between the Jews and Romans, and c. 17 recites the decree of C. Cæsar concerning the privileges, immunities, and honours of the Jewish nation.

XXVII. [1] *intentionem;* another reading gives *intentationem*, both here and in c. 46, and the frequentative verb has doubtless frequently a sense of threatening. It is twice used by Virgil, Æn. I. 91. VI. 572. Lactantius (de. M. P. 5.) has *impias manus in Deum intentavit;* for which phrase the Vulgate uses *extendere manus in aliquem*, and in Act. Apost. xii. 1. renders ἐπέβαλεν by *misit Herodes rex manus*. But we have *crimen ambitionis intendere*, de Hab. Mul. c. 4. In Arnobius *intendere* often means "to urge in argument," with a sense something like *objicere*, and so in Lactantius (Ep. D. I. c. 45.) *intentabant autem pro crimine id ipsum*, &c.

[2] *obstruimus gradum*, i.e. we offer opposition. See ad c. 1.

[3] *quod cum possimus*, &c. i.e. "that whereas we might both sacrifice to your gods, and yet retain privately our own opinions (*propositum*) we prefer this obstinate conduct." *obstinatio* was a crime frequently charged to the Christians. See Plin. Ep. x. 97. Tertullian says, ad Nat. I.

crificare in præsenti, et illæsi abire manente apud animum proposito, obstinationem saluti præferamus. Datis scilicet consilium, quo vobis abutamur; sed agnoscimus, unde talia suggerantur, quis totum hoc agitet, et quomodo nunc astutia suadendi nunc duritia sæviendi ad constantiam nostram dejiciendam[4] operetur. Ille scilicet spiritus dæmoniacæ et angelicæ paraturæ, qui noster ob divortium æmulus et ob dei gratiam invidus, de mentibus vestris adversus nos prœliatur[5], occulta inspiratione, modulatis et subornatis ad omnem, quam in primordio exorsi sumus, et judicandi perversitatem et sæviendi iniquitatem. Nam licet subjecta sit nobis tota vis dæmonum et ejusmodi spirituum, ut nequam tamen servi metui[6] nonnunquam contumaciam miscent, et lædere gestiunt quos alias verentur: odium enim etiam timor inspirat; præterquam quod desperata conditio eorum ex prædamnatione[7] solatium reputat fruendæ interim malignitatis de

CAP. XXVII.

17. *de obstinationibus vero vel præsumptionibus, si qua proponitis, ne istæ quidem ad communionem comparationis absistunt;* the meaning of which latter clause is: that even these qualities which you consider peculiarly ours, will not shrink (*absistunt*) in any way from a fair comparison (*communio comparationis*) with yours; *ad* being "with reference to" and *absistunt* absolute; he afterwards in the next chapter explains the *capitulum obstinationis* in the eyes of the heathen.

[4] *dejiciendam*, v. ad c. 12.

[5] *prœliatur de mentibus;* i. e. tanquam de loco munito. *modulatis;* in a passive sense, which is very uncommon, but I have collected a few instances of the like usage of other verbs, ad c. 2. *quam in primordio exorsi sumus.* i. e. in c. 1 and 2.

[6] *metui contumaciam miscent. miscere* twice takes a dative in Virgil. Æn. VII. 661. VIII. 432.

[7] *prædamnatione*, v. ad c. 23. "besides that their condition, desperate from being already condemned, gleans from a respite of their fate, the consolation of enjoying their malice in the mean time."

CAP. XXVII.

pœnæ mora. Et tamen apprehensi subiguntur et conditioni suæ succidunt[8], et quos de longinquo oppugnant, de proximo obsecrant. Itaque dum vice[9] rebellantium ergastulorum[10], sive carcerum, vel metallorum, vel hoc genus pœnalis servitutis erumpunt adversus nos, in quorum potestate sunt, certi et impares se esse et hoc magis perditos: ingratis resistimus ut æquales, et repugnamus perseverantes[11] in eo quod oppugnant, et illos nunquam magis detriumphamus, quam quum pro fidei obstinatione damnamur.

I now come to the second part of your charge, that of treason, in that we offer no sacrifices for Cæsar.

XXVIII. Quoniam autem facile iniquum videretur, liberos homines invitos urgeri ad sacrificandum (nam et alias divinæ rei faciundæ libens animus indicitur): certe ineptum existimaretur, si

[8] *conditioni suæ succidunt;* "they yield to their fate." The word occurs both in Lucretius and Virgil, but without any case, which however is well employed in the text, as the expression is exactly equivalent to *succumbere*. Comp. de Pudic. I. *ne mæchiæ et fornicationi succidere cogantur.* The *apprehensi* here is not exactly like that word in c. 15, but more like the simple *prensi*.

[9] *vice rebellantium;* i. e. ex more, tanquam rebellantia. Compare de Idol. c. 13. *omnem adflatum ejus vice pestis etiam de longinquo devitemus,* and infr. c. 34. *dei vice.*

[10] *ergastulum* is generally a prison in the country for agricultural slaves, (Juv. XIV. 24.) *carcer* an ordinary gaol, *metalla* the mines to which criminals were condemned. It could hardly be supposed that any one could be perplexed by this mention of the prisons for their inmates, yet Casaubon thought it necessary to be explained in a long note, (Hist. August. vol. I. p. 386. ed. 1671.) alleging the frequent mistakes on the subject.

[11] *perseverantes in eo quod oppugnant;* i. e. "steadily holding the very position which they attack." *obstinatio fidei;* the word *obstinatio* is generally used absolutely; but since a man may be said *obstinare mentem*, or *fidem*, there is nothing difficult in the expression *obstinatio fidei.* It happens that Tacitus uses the identical words to express inviolable fidelity. Hist. III. 39. *Blæso, super claritatem natalium, et elegantiam morum, fidei obstinatio fuit;* i. e. erga Vitellium.

CAP. XXVIII.

quis ab alio cogeretur ad honorem deorum, quos ultro sui caussa placare deberet, ne[1] præ manu esset jure libertatis dicere: Nolo mihi Jovem propitium; tu, quis es? me conveniat Janus iratus ex qua velit fronte; quid tibi mecum est? Formati[2] estis ab iisdem utique spiritibus, ut nos pro salute imperatoris sacrificare cogatis, et imposita est tam vobis necessitas cogendi, quam nobis obligatio periclitandi. Ventum est igitur ad secundum titulum[3] læsæ augustioris majestatis, siquidem majore formidine et callidiore timiditate Cæsarem observatis[4], quam ipsum de Olympo Jovem, et merito si sciatis[5]. Quis enim ex viventibus non quolibet mortuo tuo potior? Sed nec hoc vos ratione facitis potius quam respectu præsentaneæ[6] potestatis, adeo et in isto irreligiosi erga deos ves-

XXVIII. [1] *ne præ manu esset*, &c. Lest a man should be able readily to retort, &c. So de Test. An. c. 4. ad fin. *præ manu occurrit dicere.*

[2] *Formati estis ut cogatis.* "your hearts are moulded (v. Bentl. ad Hor. Car. III. 24. 54.) by the same evil spirits (v. c. 22.) to compel us," &c.

[3] *ad secundum titulum.* In c. 10. the two counts of the indictment had been stated: 1. *Deos non colitis;* 2. *Sacrificia pro imperatoribus non impenditis;* and therefore the Christians were called *rei sacrilegii et majestatis.* From c. 10. to this point, Tertullian has been defending them on the first charge and going into some incidental explanations. He now proceeds to the second; which was more dangerous than the other, and closely connected with it, for, as he says in the parallel passage, ad Nat. I. 17. *secunda religio constituitur Cæsarianæ majestatis.*

[4] *observatis;* see Virg. G. IV. 212. *de Olympo;* I do not think this is equivalent to *Olympi* or *Olympicum,* though instances are certainly found of the occurrence of *de* in this sense much earlier than is generally supposed. See Lewis on the Romance languages. I would rather supply some active participle here.

[5] *et merito si sciatis;* "and justly too, if you did but know it." *nec hoc vos ratione facitis;* "you do not know even this on principle, but from," &c.

[6] *præsentaneæ,* v. c. 16.

CAP. XXVIII.

tros deprehendimini, qui plus timoris humano dominio dicatis. Citius denique apud vos per omnes deos, quam per unum genium Cæsaris pejeratur[7].

But to make this charge valid, you must prove that the Gods are worth sacrificing to.

XXIX. Constet igitur prius, si[1] isti, quibus sacrificatur, salutem imperatori vel cuilibet homini impertiri possunt, et ita nos crimini addicite. Si angeli aut dæmones substantia pessimi spiritus[2] beneficium aliquod operantur, si perditi conservant, si damnati liberant, si denique (quod in conscientia vestra est) mortui vivos tuentur: jam utique suas primo statuas et imagines et ædes tuerentur, quæ, opinor Cæsarum milites excubiis suis salva præstant[3]. Puto autem, hæ ipsæ materiæ de me-

[7] By the civil law *perjeratio per genium Cæsaris* was punishable, but *pejeratio per Deos* was not. A curious statement of cognizable offences against the canonized Augustus will be found in Sueton. Tiber. c. 58.

XXIX. [1] *Constet, si,* &c. v. ad c. 23. *et ita* means *tum demum,* i. e. as soon as you have satisfactorily proved the necessary premises.

[2] *Substantia pessimi spiritus*—"spirits as they are essentially most vicious;"—*substantia pessimi* is opposed to *beneficium,* like *perditi* to *conservant,* &c. "as if it were likely that those beings who could do nothing for themselves, should so depart from their nature as to seek the good of others." The same antithetical structure of the sentence, on the same subject is found in c. 2. de Hab. Mul. '*nihil ad integritatem peccatores, nihil ad castitatem adamatores, nihil ad timorem Dei desertores spiritus monstrare potuerunt.*' So too S. Cyprian de Idol. Van. c. 1. *non desinunt perditi perdere, et depravati errorem pravitatis infundere.*

[3] The temples not only possessed sacred treasures, but were used also as depositories for private property, and guarded by military sentinels. See Juv. XIV. 261. Plaut. Bacch. II. 3. 78. and compare Arnobius (VI. 21.) *cur eos* (sc. Deos) *sub validissimis clavibus ingentibusque sub claustris habetis inclusos, ac ne forte fur aliquis aut nocturnus irrepat latro, æditui mille protegitis atque excubitoribus mille?* together with S. Cypr. ad Demetr. c. 3. To this is the allusion de Cor. Mil. c. 11. *excubabit pro templis quibus renuntiavit?*—*tota templa de nutu constant;* i. e. "their whole existence and substance comes from the emperor;" *hæ ipsæ*

tallis Cæsarum veniunt, et tota templa de nutu Cæsaris constant. Multi denique dii habuerunt Cæsarem iratum[4]. Facit ad caussam, si et propitium, cum illis aliquid aut liberalitatis aut privilegii, confert. Ita qui sunt in Cæsaris potestate, cujus et toti sunt, quomodo habebunt salutem Cæsaris in potestate, ut eam præstare posse videantur, quam facilius ipsi a Cæsare consequantur? Ideo ergo committimus[5] in majestatem imperatorum, quia illos non subjicimus rebus suis; quia non ludimus de officio salutis eorum[6], qui eam non putamus in manibus esse plumbatis. Sed vos religiosi, qui eam quæritis ubi non est, petitis a

materiæ are the marbles and precious metals which constitute the gods, and the *tota templa* are the materials used, together with the authority for their construction. Compare the use of *constare* in c. 25.

[4] *Multi denique Dii*, &c. *habuerunt;* this was the formal word. Instances of *irati* and *propitii Cæsares* may easily be found. Compare S. Ambros. ad Valent. adv. Symmachum. *Vos pacem Diis vestris ab Imperatoribus obsecratis, nos ipsis Imperatoribus a Christo pacem rogamus;* and above, c. 5. *homo jam deo propitius esse debebit.*

[5] *committimus;* absolutely. And thus *lege committere*, and *in* or *contra legem committere* were technically used. Cic. Brut. XII. *quasi committeret contra legem, quo quis judicio circumveniretur.* There are other significations, too, of *committere* in which it is sometimes absolutely used.

[6] *non ludimus de officio salutis eorum;* It is clear enough what these words mean: viz. "we do not make a mockery of our prayers for the emperor's welfare;" but it is not so easy to explain the literal construction of the text; *officium* may of course be applied to any act of necessity, or duty, or civility, and *officium salutis alicujus*, it seems, must be the *officium* in the performance of which the well-doing of the party is implied, (in c. 13. we have *de salute Cæsarum curare*,) *de* will then be "with reference to, in the case of" this duty, and *ludere* will remain to be taken absolutely. *plumbatis* is not synonymous with *plumbeis*, (any more than *rutilatus* with *rutilus*,) see note, p. 86, but refers to the use of lead in joining the fingers, wrists, &c. of the statues. So c. 12. *ante plumbum et glutinum*, &c.

CAP. XXIX.

quibus dari non potest, præterito eo in cujus est potestate. Insuper eos debellatis, qui eam sciunt petere, qui etiam possunt impetrare, dum sciunt petere.

In truth, we offer in Cæsar's behalf more acceptable victims, and more sincere prayers, to a more mighty God.

XXX. Nos enim pro salute imperatorum deum invocamus æternum, deum verum, deum vivum, quem et ipsi imperatores propitium sibi præter ceteros malunt. Sciunt, quis illis dederit imperium; sciunt, qua homines[1], quis et animam; sentiunt, eum deum esse solum, in cujus solius potestate sunt, a quo sunt secundi, post quem primi, ante omnes et super omnes deos. Quidni? cum super omnes homines, qui utique vivunt et mortuis antistant[2]. Recogitant, quousque vires imperii sui valeant, et ita deum intelligunt; adversus quem valere non possunt, per eum valere se cognoscunt. Cœlum denique debellet imperator, cœlum captivum triumpho suo invehat, cœlo mittat excubias, cœlo vectigalia imponat[3]. Non potest; ideo magnus est, quia cœlo minor est. Illius enim est ipse, cujus et cœlum est et omnis creatura[4]. Inde est

XXX. [1] *Sciunt quis illis;* "They know as emperors who gave them their authority, and, as mere human beings, who gave them their lives." So c. 5. *qua et homo.*

[2] *mortuis antistant;* as before. *quis enim ex viventibus non quolibet mortuo tuo potior?* Just below, *deum intelligunt* is like *mures et araneæ intelligunt,* in c. 12.

[3] The usual proceedings of the Romans with a conquered province are here enumerated.—*Denique* (i. e. if no other argument will convince him of his inferiority) "let Cæsar subjugate heaven (*debellet*), let him carry its representation in his triumph, (like *captiva Corinthus,* Hor. Ep. II. 1. 193.) let him send garrisons to it, let him lay taxes on it."

[4] *creatura.* This form of word was very much affected in late Latin, and several instances of the fact will be found in Tertullian; we have had already in this Apology *paratura,* which in-

imperator, unde est et homo antequam imperator; inde potestas illi, unde et spiritus. Illuc suspicientes Christiani manibus expansis[5], quia innocuis, capite nudo, quia non erubescimus, denique sine monitore, quia de pectore, oramus omnes semper pro omnibus imperatoribus, vitam illis prolixam, imperium securum, domum tutam, exercitus fortes, senatum fidelem, populum probum, orbem quietum, et quæcunque hominis et Cæsaris vota sunt. Hæc ab alio orare non possum, quam a quo scio me consecuturum, quoniam et ipse est qui solus præstat, et ego sum cui impetrare debetur[6], fa-

CAP. XXX.

deed occurs elsewhere very often, and may be generally explained as *quicquid paratur*, being nearly equivalent to *apparatus*; it is thrice applied to the sacred writings (adv. Psych. c. 11. de Monog. c. 7, and infra c. 47, compare the note in p. 58). *litteratura* is not, as in earlier authors, *cognitio literarum*, but rather *quicquid literis mandatum exstat*. *scripturæ* (c. 20) appears without doubt, emphatically, for Holy Scripture, v. e. g. De Præscr. Hæret. though less perhaps as opposed to profane writings, than as to tradition, v. Cor. Mil. c. 2 and 3. (Lactant. and Cypr. generally add *sanctæ*, as does Tertullian sometimes). In the tract de Cult. Fœm. c. 7, we have *capillatura*, and adv. Marc. 1. 28. *suffectura*, which appears to be *quod rei explendæ sufficitur*, (compare *suffectio materiæ*, Arnobius VII. 2.) but see Bishop Kaye, Tertull. p. 192. The *creatura* of the text is the *factura* of Cyprian, and the *quodcumque creatur* of Lucretius; it is used by Prudentius and many late writers.

[5] *manibus expansis*; '*Non attollimus tantum manus sed etiam expandimus, et dominica passione modulantes et orantes confitemur Christum.*' de Orat. c. 11. See too the whole chapter, adv. Marc. III. 18. *Sine monitore*; 'without any person to dictate our prayers to us;' as was the custom with the pagans, where the priest was said *præire*; but both the habit and the phrases are well known; as also the *capite operto* to which the *nudo* of the Christians is here opposed; compare S. Cyprian de Laps. c. 1. *Ab impio sceleratoque velamine quo illic velabantur sacrificantium capita captiva, caput vestrum liberum mansit.*

[6] *cui impetrare debetur*; 'to whom it is due that I should obtain what I ask.' So c. 33. *talis postulo, qui merear impetrare*; i. e. I, as a Christian, and God's servant, opposed to a heathen. In Lactantius (M. P. extr.) *tu, qui*

CAP. XXX.

mulus ejus, qui eum solum observo, qui propter disciplinam ejus occidor, qui ei offero opimam et majorem hostiam, quam ipse mandavit, orationem[7] de carne pudica, de anima innocenti, de spiritu sancto profectam. Non grana thuris unius assis, Arabicæ arboris lacrimas, nec duas meri guttas, nec sanguinem reprobi bovis[8] mori optantis, et post omnia inquinamenta etiam conscientiam spurcam: ut mirer, cum hostiæ probentur penes vos a vitiosissimis sacerdotibus, cur præcordia potius victimarum, quam ipsorum sacrificantium examinentur. Sic itaque nos ad deum expansos ungulæ fodiant, cruces suspendant, ignes lambant, gladii guttura detruncent, bestiæ insiliant; paratus est ad omne supplicium ipse habitus orantis Christiani. Hoc agite, boni præsides, ex-

a Deo mereris audiri, is applied to a *confessor* as opposed to an ordinary Christian. *opimam hostiam.* de Orat. c. 22. *saturatam orationem velut opimam hostiam admovere*, where *admovere* is the formal expression; the epithet *majorem*, from its peculiar technicality, almost loses its comparative sense, which refers merely to another special class of victims, (*quam* agreeing with *hostiam*), and yet Tertullian has joined it elsewhere (de Idol. c. 6) with two other comparatives as if he meant it to be taken strictly: *saginatiorem et auratiorem et majorem hostiam cædis.*

[7] *orationem de carne pudica; oratio* is equivalent to *preces* or *adoratio* as very commonly, but perhaps I may as well mention that *adoro* and *adoratio* are also equivalent in late writers simply to *adloquor* and *adlocutio*, e. g. Apul. Met. III. 44. *caro pudica* alludes to the freedom of the suppliant from carnal pollution, and *spiritus sanctus* here is merely *animus pius.*

[8] *reprobi bovis*; v. c. 14. The word is like ἀδόκιμος and is applied to false money. It is found in the Digests, and in the Vulgate, e. g. Jerem. vi. 30. *Argentum reprobum vocate eos, quia Dominus projecit illos.* ad Cor. ii. 13. 5. *nisi forte reprobi estis. mori optantis* refers to the miserable state of the victim, like the *gallinam claudentem oculos* in Juv. XII.

torquete[9] animam deo supplicantem pro imperatore. Hic erit crimen, ubi veritas est dei et devotio[10].

CAP. XXX.

XXXI. [1]Adulati nunc sumus imperatori, et mentiti vota, quæ diximus, ad evadendam scilicet vim. Plane proficit ista fallacia[2]. Admittitis enim nos probare quodcunque defendimus. Qui ergo putaveris, nihil nos de salute Cæsarum curare, inspice dei voces, litteras[3] nostras, quas neque ipsi supprimimus et plerique casus ad extraneos transferunt. Scito ex illis, præceptum esse nobis ad redundantiam benignitatis, etiam pro inimicis deum orare, et persecutoribus nostris bona precari. Qui magis inimici et persecutores Christianorum, quam de quorum majestate convenimur in crimen? Sed etiam nominatim atque manifeste: Orate, inquit[4],

And this we are bound to do by our Scriptures.

[9] *extorquète animam;* i. e. *occidite.* The phrase occurred before in c. 9. Lactantius (D. I. v. 1.) has copied and expanded the expression, *dicatas Deo mentes evisceratis corporibus extorquent.*

[10] "*Here* the prayer is to be accounted a crime, where the God addressed is the true one, and the feeling of the supplicant sincere." Yet this would seem almost to require *devotionis.* The whole clause is by some considered an interpolation.

XXXI. [1] *Adulati nunc sumus et mentiti.* The same form of hypothetical argument occurs in Juv. VI. 634. *Fingimus hæc,* &c. and de Cult. Fæm. c. 8. *Videlicet nunc et vir et sexus æmulus fæminas a suis depello.*

[2] *Plane proficit.* The reasoning is this: Admitting we have falsified ourselves in alleging our respect for the emperor, yet this very deceit aids our cause, for you must allow us to approve a line of conduct which we openly defend and assert that we practice.

[3] *literas nostras;* sc. sacras. elsewhere *literaturam* and *paraturam* nostram. *neque......supprimimus......et......transferunt.* This phraseology is by no means uncommon in good writers, but it occurs more frequently after the Flavian age, especially in Suetonius.

[4] *inquit;* sc. Apostolus (v. ad c. 1.) ad Tim. i. 2. 2. *pro regibus, et omnibus qui in sublimitate sunt, ut quietam et tranquillam vitam agamus in omni pietate et castitate.* Vulg.

CAP. XXXI.

pro regibus, et pro principibus, et potestatibus, ut omnia tranquilla sint vobis. Cum enim concutitur[5] imperium, concussis etiam ceteris membris ejus, utique et nos, licet extranei a turbis, in aliquo loco casus invenimur.

And by our other tenets and opinions.

XXXII. [1]Est et alia major necessitas nobis orandi pro imperatoribus, etiam pro omni statu imperii rebusque Romanis, qui vim maximam universo orbi imminentem, ipsamque clausulam seculi acerbitates horrendas comminantem Romani imperii commeatu[2] scimus retardari. Ita quæ nolumus experiri, ea dum precamur differri, Romanæ diuturnitati favemus. Sed et juramus, sicut non per genios Cæsarum, ita per salutem eorum, quæ est augustior omnibus geniis. Nescitis genios dæmonas dici, et inde diminutiva voce dæmonia? Nos judicium dei suspicimus in imperatoribus, qui gentibus illos præfecit. Id in eis scimus esse, quod

[5] *concutitur imperium.* The expression is not like that in c. 25. *Cretam Romanis fascibus concuti sineret;* or that of *concussio* in c. 7. but means simply political disturbance, like πόλιν σεῖσαι. Pind. Pyth. IV. 272. Lucan. I. 5. *certatum totis concussi viribus orbis.* So S. Cyprian ad Demetr. 1. *omnia ista quibus nunc mundus quatitur et urgetur.* Min. Fel. c. 2. *Cum periculo quateris.*

XXXII. [1] *Est alia major necessitas orandi nobis......qui scimus* ......sc. inde quod scimus; the construction is not unusual.

[2] *Commeatus.* This word in its simple signification implies only the *actus meandi, meandi copia,* or *transitus.* (Arnobius II. 16, applies it to the act of respiration.) It is then used for *quicquid commeat,* e. g. for a convoy, or, absolutely, for the provisions themselves. In its sense of *meandi copia* it easily came to mean the *venia discedendi* granted to a soldier, and thus generally an extension of a limited time (*commeatus deliberandi* c. 46.) or a *respite,* as in the present passage. So Seneca, Epist. 54. *Longum mihi commeatum dedit mala valetudo; repente me invasit;* though there it is only a conjecture (however true) of Lipsius for *comitatum.* On the argument, see c. 39, *oramus......pro mora finis.*

CAP. XXXII.

deus voluit[3], ideoque et salvum volumus esse, quod deus voluit, et pro magno id juramento habemus. Ceterum dæmonas, id est genios, adjurare[4] consuevimus, ut illos de hominibus exigamus, non dejerare, ut illis honorem divinitatis conferamus.

We do not call Cæsar a god, for that would be saying that he is not Cæsar.

XXXIII. Sed quid ego amplius de religione atque pietate Christiana in imperatorem? quem necesse est[1] suspiciamus ut eum, quem dominus noster elegerit. Et merito dixerim, noster est magis Cæsar, ut a nostro deo constitutus. Itaque et in eo plus ego illi operor in salutem[2], non solum quod eam ab eo postulo, qui potest præstare, aut quod talis postulo, qui merear impetrare, sed

[3] *Id in eis scimus*, &c. i. e. "We recognize one fact in their existence and their position, viz. God's will;" or, the meaning may be this: Whatever be their character, whatever their conduct to ourselves, there is nothing in them, or proceeding from them, but what God has appointed.

[4] On the peculiar meanings of *juro*, *adjuro*, *ejero* and *dejero*, cf. de Idol. c. 20, 21.

XXXIII. [1] *necesse est.* This phrase is used by Tertullian to express the inevitable conduct or principles under certain circumstances of Christians who are really such in deed. He says: According to the tenets and opinions which you yourselves admit us to hold and which you persecute us for holding, we *must* respect the Emperor, for we believe him to be appointed by God. So in c. 36. *ii mores* (sc. Christiani) are spoken of *quibus civilitas necesse habet exhiberi.* At the beginning of c. 45 the expression is not exactly similar, as it means there: that under the peculiar circumstances of instruction and superintendence and penalty, the Christians were necessarily exclusively enabled to perform their duties.

[2] The construction of this sentence is: *Itaque ego illi plus operor in salutem* (i. e. plus facio ad salutem ejus) *in eo......quod ......non solum ab eo......aut talis postulo......sed etiam quod......temperans commendo.* With the expression *plus illi operor in salutem*, compare what has been said, ad c. 29, on the phrase *de officio salutis. soli subjicio* is equivalent to *secundum statuo;* so c. 30. *a quo secundi sunt. temperans majestatem* is 'modifying in some degree the dignity assigned to Cæsar.'

CAP. XXXIII.

etiam quod temperans majestatem Cæsaris infra deum, magis illum commendo deo, cui soli subjicio. Subjicio autem, cui non adæquo. Non enim deum imperatorem dicam, vel quia mentiri nescio, vel quia illum deridere non audeo, vel quia nec ipse se deum volet dici. Si homo sit, interest hominis deo cedere; satis habeat appellari imperator. Grande et hoc nomen est, quod a deo traditur. Negat illum imperatorem, qui deum dicit. Nisi homo sit, non est imperator. Hominem se esse etiam triumphans in illo sublimissimo curru admonetur. Suggeritur enim ei a tergo: respice post te, hominem memento te[3]. Et utique hoc magis gaudet tanta se gloria coruscare, ut illi admonitio conditionis suæ sit necessaria. [Minor erat, si tunc deus diceretur, quia non vere diceretur.] Major est, qui revocatur, ne se deum existimet.

And would be dangerous and ill-omened too.

XXXIV. Augustus imperii formator, ne dominum quidem dici se volebat[1]; et hoc enim dei est cognomen. Dicam plane imperatorem dominum, sed more communi, sed quando non cogor ut dominum dei vice[2] dicam. Ceterum liber sum

[3] On the peculiar feeling of the ancients which led to this custom amongst others, see a learned note of Casaubon ad Sueton. Aug. c. 91. *et utique,* &c. the *hoc* refers to *coruscare se,* and the *ut* answers to *tanta.*

XXXIV. [1] *Domini appellationem ut maledictum et opprobrium semper exhorruit.* Suet. Aug. 53. where the expression *maledictum* may be remarked as one which occurs in the same chapter. Tiberius also interdicted the title with similar sentiments; *denuntiavit ne se* (dominum) *contumeliæ caussa nominaret.* Suet. in vit. c. 2. Julian made an attempt to revive this moderation, but was ridiculed, as might have been expected, for his pains. Domitian legalized and enjoined the titles of *Dominus* and *Deus.* Suet. 13.

[2] *dei vice;* in the sense of God. v. ad c. 27.

CAP. XXXIV

illi[3]; dominus enim meus unus est, deus omnipotens et æternus, idem qui et ipsius. Qui pater patriæ est, quomodo dominus est? Sed est gratius nomen pietatis, quam potestatis; etiam familiæ magis patres, quam domini vocantur. Tanto abest[4], ut imperator deus debeat dici, quod non potest credi, non modo turpissima, sed et perniciosa adulatione; tamquam si habens imperatorem, alterum appelles, nonne maximam et inexorabilem offensam contrahes ejus, quem habuisti, etiam ipsi timendam, quem appellasti[5]? Esto religiosus in deum, qui vis illum propitium imperatori. Desine alium deum colere vel credere, atque ita et hunc deum dicere, cui deo opus est. Si non de mendacio erubescit adulatio ejusmodi, hominem deum appellans, timeat saltem de infausto. Maledictum est ante apotheosin deum Cæsarem nuncupare[6].

[3] *liber sum illi;* 'As far as regards him, I am free, *he* is not *my* lord.' The pronoun is something like those in Persius (vi. 64.) '*minui mihi, sed tibi totum est.*' Compare too c. 13. '*nobis dei sunt;*' and the dative *mundo* in Lucan. i. 664.

[4] *Tanto abest,* &c. This sentence as usually punctuated is very confused, but it becomes clearer by putting the words *quod non potest credi* into a parenthesis, which must be then taken simply as a passing remark *quod incredibile est.* The *Tanto* then expresses the inference drawn from the previous arguments. "So little thus are we bound to call the emperor a god, in a style of flattery which is not only disgraceful to us, but actually hazardous to him:" and the *tanquam* introduces an exemplification of the assertion contained in the word *perniciosa,* from the ordinary habits of life. *habens imperatorem* means "having an emperor over you who is actually and really such," and *habere* is contrasted with *appellare.*

[5] *contrahes offensam ejus,* &c. "would you not give matter of offence to him who *was* your master, which might be dangerous even to him whom you thus called so?" *contrahere offensam,* an ordinary phrase.

[6] *Maledictum est,* &c. There is a remarkably apposite passage

CAP. XXXV.

You call us Cæsar's enemies because we do not riotously keep his festivals; What say you to the secret traitors among yourselves?

XXXV. Propterea igitur publici hostes Christiani, quia imperatoribus neque vanos neque mentientes neque temerarios honores dicant, quia veræ religionis homines[1] etiam sollemnia eorum conscientia potius quam lascivia celebrant. Grande videlicet officium, focos et toros in publicum educere, vicatim epulari, civitatem tabernæ habitu abolefacere, vino lutum cogere[2], catervatim cursitare ad injurias, ad impudentias, ad libidinis illecebras. Siccine exprimitur publicum gaudium per dedecus publicum? Hæccine sollemnes dies principum decent, quæ alios dies non decent? Qui observant disciplinam[3] de Cæsaris respectu, hi eam propter

in Tacitus (Ann. xv. extr.) where, upon the vote of Cerealis that a temple as soon as possible should be raised to Nero, the historian adds, *Quod quidem ille decernebat, tanquam mortale fastigium egresso, et venerationem hominum merito, quorundam dolo ad omina sui exitus vertebatur, nam Deum honor Principi non ante habetur, quam agere inter homines desierit.* "Sit Divus dum non sit vivus" was the remark of Caracalla, when informed that his brother Geta had been canonized.

XXXV. [1] *Homines veræ religionis;* see ad c. 19. though this phrase with the adjective, is intelligible enough. *conscientiâ potius;* rather internally than, &c. *abolefacere;* this hardly seems to be correct, but if so it must mean *deformare, dehonestare.* '*habitu obolefacere*' has been conjectured.

[2] *vino lutum cogere;* This expression is obviously used to denote extravagance and debauchery; Theodorus pourtrayed the cruel nature of Tiberius by calling him πηλὸν αἵματι πεφυραμένον (Sueton. Tib. 57. which would be *sanguine lutum coactum.*) *cogere* is the technical term employed in almost every second chapter of Celsus, to express the inspissation of any powder or liquid for medical purposes. e. g. p. 332. ed. 4to. 1785. *resinæ pineæ, cumini, singulorum,* p. II. *uvæ taminiæ sine seminibus,* p. IV. *mellis quantum satis sit ad ea cogenda.* Compare the index of Matthiæ. This is the precise sense of the text; but there is a very singular use of it in c. 5. de Pall. viz. *de piscibus feras cogere,* which I am more inclined to refer hither, than to explain according to Semler.

[3] *disciplina;* this word in ecclesiastical Latin descends through a curious variety of significations;

Cæsarem deserent, et malorum morum licentia pietas erit, occasio luxuriæ religio deputabitur? O nos merito damnandos! Cur enim vota et gaudia Cæsarum casti et sobrii et probi expungimus? cur die læto non laureis postes obumbramus? nec lucernis diem infringimus? Honesta res est sollemnitate publica exigente induere domui tuæ habitum alicujus novi lupanaris[4]. Velim tamen in hac quoque religione secundæ majestatis, de qua in secundum sacrilegium convenimur Christiani, non celebrando vobiscum sollemnia Cæsarum, quo more celebrari nec modestia nec verecundia nec pudicitia permittunt, sed occasio voluptatis magis quam digna

CAP XXXV.

in early authors its special sense of *discipline*, in our acceptation of the word, was almost monopolized by military affairs, examples of which may be found in any glossary of Livy; in the present passage it makes its nearest approach to this sense, meaning simply 'peace and order;' in c. 30. (*propter disciplinam ejus occidor*) it is in the old sense of 'the system of any particular school,' *disciplina ejus* being like *religio Dei* and signifying especially the Christian religion, and in this way it is also used, c. 2, 7, 39. and very frequently elsewhere. It is likewise found for what is termed *discipline* in ecclesiastical language, and particularly throughout the tract *de præscriptionibus Hæreticorum*, where numerous instances of this kind occur. It is further employed to signify any strict method or rule of life, as adv. Valent. c. 1. *disciplina non terretur*, and is applied by S. Cyprian to the celibate, *de Habitu Virginum*, c. 1. sqq. Afterwards *disciplina regularis* very naturally was taken for the monastic rule, and from that for the penalties attached to its infraction, for the infliction of such penalties, and at length for the actual instrument with which they were inflicted; and in accordance with the punishment statutably most common, *disciplina* became literally synonymous with *virga*.

[4] de Idol. c. 15. *si lupanaribus renuntiasti, ne indueris domui tuæ faciem novi lupanaris. de qua convenimur in sacrilegium;* so above c. 31. *de majestate convenimur in crinem.* The construction of the following rather long sentence is: *Velim in hac* (*de qua*, &c......) *fidem et veritatem demonstrare, ne ii...qui nolunt...... deprehendantur deteriores.*

CAP. XXXV.

ratio persuasit, fidem et veritatem vestram demonstrare, ne forte et isthic deteriores Christianis deprehendantur, qui nos nolunt Romanos haberi, sed hostes principum Romanorum. Ipsos Quirites, ipsam vernaculam septem collium plebem convenio[5], an alicui Cæsari suo parcat illa lingua Romana? Testis est Tiberis[6], et scholæ bestiarum. Jam si pectoribus ad translucendum quandam specularem materiam natura obduxisset, cujus non præcordia insculpta apparerent novi ac novi Cæsaris scenam[7] congiario dividundo præsidentis? etiam illa hora qua acclamant:

De nostris annis tibi Jupiter augeat annos.

Hæc Christianus tam enuntiare non novit, quam

[5] *convenio;* see the note in p. 36.

[6] *Testis est Tiberis;* This may allude to the scurrility of the lower orders whose habitations were towards the river, but it is generally explained as referring to a species of pasquinades which were attached to the monuments of the Cæsars and others in the Campus Martius near the Tiber. Ammianus Marcellinus (xxv. 10.) speaking of the funeral of Julian says: *Cujus suprema et cineres, si qui tunc juste consuleret, non Cydnus videre deberet quamvis gratissimus amnis et liquidus, sed ad perpetuandam gloriam recte factorum præterlambere Tiberis intersecans urbem æternam, divorumque veterum monumenta præstringens.* See the note of Valesius, who has overlooked the pertinent passage Æn. vi. 873. (v. Heyne). Gibbon at the end of his twenty-fourth chapter, has worked the aspirations of Ammianus into his magnificent text, but he could not omit the exercise which this *lingua Romana* found itself over his favourite hero.

[7] *cujus non præcordia,* &c. "on whose heart would not be found graven the picture of a succession of Cæsars (*novi ac novi Cæsaris*) presiding over the largess distributed on their accession?" *scenam insculpta* is said to be like *inscripti nomina regum* Virg. Ecl. iii. 106, but I would rather see *scena;* on *congiario* see the Intpp. ad Plin. Paneg. *optare de novo Cæsare;* "to make a vow about." For *ut* see the note p. 94. *depostulatores* sc. ad supplicium.

CAP. XXXV.

de novo Cæsare optare. Sed vulgus, inquis. Ut vulgus, tamen Romani, nec ulli magis depostulatores Christianorum, quam vulgus. Plane[8] ceteri ordines pro auctoritate religiosi ex fide; nihil hosticum de ipso senatu, de equite, de castris, de palatiis ipsis spirat. Unde Cassii, et Nigri et Albini? unde qui inter duas laurus obsident Cæsarem? unde qui faucibus ejus exprimendis[9] palæstricam exercent? unde qui armati palatium irrumpunt, omnibus Sigeriis atque Partheniis audaciores? De Romanis, nisi fallor, id est, non de Christianis. Atque adeo omnes illi sub ipsa usque impietatis eruptione et sacra faciebant pro salute imperatoris, et genium ejus dejerabant, alii foris, alii intus, et utique publicorum hostium nomen Christianis dabant. Sed et qui nunc scelestarum partium socii aut plausores quotidie revelantur, post vindemiam parricidarum racematio[10] superstes, quam recentissimis[11] et ramosissimis laureis postes

[8] *Plane ceteri ordines*, &c. It seems strange that any one could possibly overlook the irony of this passage, yet Mosheim in his Disquisition concerning the chronology of this treatise has not only gravely quoted the several assertions as serious, but has actually applied *hosticum* to the Christians instead of the Cæsars. *Plane* commences an ironical argument in c. 15. *plane religiosiores estis in cavea;* and elsewhere.

[9] *exprimendis* is equivalent to *elidendis*. *de Romanis id* sc. *genus hominum*, v. c. 44. *de vestris semper*, &c. for *atque adeo* see p. 82.

[10] *racematio;* "the gleaning that remains of the murderers, after the general harvest;" i. e. after the principals had been put to death. The metaphor is taken from the vineyard, where *racematio* answered to the *spicilegium* of the corn field. *socii* and *plausores* are those concerned in the enterprise, or well affected to it, who were day after day (*quotidie*) coming to light. *enubilabant*, sc. illustrabant, others would read *nubilabant*, comparing Persius v. 181.

[11] *recentissimis* means 'particularly fresh and green,' to shew their unbounded loyalty.

CAP. XXXV.

præstruebant? quam elatissimis et clarissimis lucernis vestibula enubilabant? quam cultissimis et superbissimis toris forum sibi dividebant? non ut gaudia publica celebrarent, sed ut vota propria jam edicerent, et in aliena sollemnitate exemplum atque imaginem spei suæ inaugurarent, nomen principis in corde mutantes[12]. Eadem officia dependunt[13] et qui astrologos et aruspices et augures et magos de Cæsarum capite consultant, quas artes ut ab angelis desertoribus proditas[14] et a deo interdictas ne suis quidem caussis adhibent Christiani. Cui autem opus est perscrutari super Cæsaris salute, nisi a quo aliquid adversus illam cogitatur

præstruebant may be taken literally, like *præstruere aditum* in Ovid. Fast. I. 563.

[12] *nomen principis in corde mutantes;* "Changing internally the name of the Emperor whose prosperity they openly pray for over their cups. (v. Brouk. ad Tibull. II. 1. 31.) i. e. giving out the name of the reigning Cæsar, and inwardly pronouncing that of him whom they would fain see his successor."

[13] *eadem officia dependunt* means: "*they* (i. e. *qui consultant,* &c.) too, who investigate the duration of Cæsar's life, perform (*dependunt*) all the sacrifices, vows, solemnities, &c. (*officia*) with the selfsame heartlessness, and therefore render them of the selfsame character (*eadem*) as the former parties."

[14] *proditas,* i. e. *memoriæ* or *humano generi.* So de hab. Mulieb. c. 2. of these same spirits, *cum materias quasdam bene occultas et artes plerasque non bene revelatas seculo multo magis imperito prodidissent; (si quidem et metallorum opera nudaverant et herbarum ingenia traduxerant* (i. e. in apertum protulerant) *et incantationum vires provulgaverant et omnem curiositatem usque ad stellarum interpretationem designaverant,)* &c. In c. 10. de Cult. Fœm. they are termed *angeli peccatores,* and are charged with similar acts. The Book of Enoch (de Hab. Mul. c. 3.) was the authority of the Fathers on these matters. On the subject of horoscopes see the commentators on Juv. VI. 553. sqq. XIV. 248. Ammianus (XXIX. 2. ad fin.) uses the expression *constellationem principis colligere,* where see the note of Lindenbr. who quotes the text *inter alia;* all the first part of the XXIXth book relates to this subject and contains some curious information.

vel optatur, aut post illam speratur et sustinetur[15]? Non enim ea mente de caris consulitur, qua de dominis. Aliter curiosa est sollicitudo sanguinis, aliter servitutis.

CAP. XXXV.

XXXVI. Si hæc ita sunt, ut hostes deprehendantur, qui Romani vocabantur, cur nos, qui hostes existimamur, Romani negamur? non possumus et Romani esse, et hostes non esse, cum hostes reperiantur qui Romani habebantur? Adeo pietas et religio et fides imperatoribus dedita non in hujusmodi officiis consistit, quibus et hostilitas magis[1] ad velamentum sui potest fungi, sed in iis moribus, quibus civilitas in imperatorem tam vere quam circa omnes necesse habet exhiberi[2]. Neque enim hæc opera bonæ mentis solis imperatoribus debentur a nobis. Nullum bonum sub exceptione personarum[3] administramus, quia nobis præstamus, qui non ab homine aut laudis, aut præmii expen-

We are compelled to be friends not only to Cæsar but to all men.

[15] *sustinetur;* this word is exactly equivalent to *expectatur,* and there is no difficulty in tracing the steps of the transition, though the termination of it is strange at first sight. Minut. Felix (ad extr.) has, *nec adnectimus arescentem coronam, sed a Deo æternis floribus vivam sustinemus.*

XXXVI. [1] *quibus hostilitas magis;* the meaning is: 'not in duties of that kind which may also be performed by an enemy, and more strictly and sedulously too (*magis*) to conceal his real sentiments (*ad velamentum sui.*)

[2] The construction is: *iis moribus, quibus* (i. e. *secundum quos*) *civilitas necesse habet* (see ad c. 33.) *exhiberi tam vere,* &c. so that *necesse habet exhiberi* is equivalent to *necessario exhibetur,* which is no very usual phraseology. But *habere* elsewhere in Tertullian has the sense of *debere.* de Anim. c. 35. *totiens animam revocari habere.* de Hab. Mul. 1. *etiam filius Dei mori habuit,* as we should say, "had to die." adv. Prax. 4. *restitui habeat patri a filio.* Lactantius D. I. IV. 30. *ipsum prædixisse quod hæreses haberent existere.*

[3] *sub exceptione personarum;* "We do none of our good acts with any exception of persons from their objects." The *sub* is like that in the phrases *sub lege, sub conditione,* &c.

CAP. XXXVI.

sum captamus, sed a deo exactore et remuneratore indifferentis benignitatis. Iidem sumus imperatoribus, qui et vicinis nostris. Male enim velle, male facere, male dicere, male cogitare de quoquam ex æquo vetamur. Quodcunque non licet in imperatorem, id nec in quemquam, quod in neminem, eo forsitan magis nec in ipsum, qui per deum tantus est.

Consider now what injury we could do you, were we so inclined.

XXXVII. Si inimicos, ut supra diximus, jubemur diligere, quem habemus odisse[1]? Item si læsi vicem referre prohibemur, ne de facto[2] pares simus, quem possumus lædere? Nam de isto ipsi recognoscite. Quoties enim in Christianos desævitis, partim animis propriis, partim legibus obsequentes? Quoties etiam præteritis vobis[3] suo jure nos inimicum vulgus invadit lapidibus et incendiis? Ipsis Bacchanalium furiis[4] nec mortuis parcunt

XXXVII. [1] *quem habemus odisse*, see note p. 86.

[2] *de facto pares simus; de facto* may either mean *hoc faciendo*, or *de* may be taken as *de crudelitate* in c. 5.

[3] *præteritis vobis;* without waiting for your authority or sentence.

[4] *Ipsis Bacchanalium furiis;* I do not think this should be taken in the sense in which Mr Evans has understood it. This writer (Theol. Lib. XIV. p. 335.) says: "The lewd riot of the Bacchanalia inflamed them (the heathen) to that pitch that not content with the customary outrages against the living they vented their fury in the cemetaries upon the dead;" as if *furiis Bacchanalium* were equivalent to *ludis Bacchi*, or *tempore ludorum*. But I think then the expression would have been simply *furiis*, or *per*, or *inter furias*, and I cannot see what appropriate force is thus to be given to *ipsis*, which would hardly be used for the mere period of an occurrence, unless to fix it with critical minuteness. When Horace says *ipsis Saturnalibus huc fugisti* he means, that of all times to leave Rome and retire to the country, that of the Saturnalia was the strangest, but such an interpretation cannot apply here, for the heathen festivals were not strange or

Christianis, quin illos de requie sepulturæ, de asylo quodam mortis, jam alios, jam nec totos avellant, dissecent, distrahant. [5]Quid tamen unquam denotastis de tam conspiratis, de tam animatis ad mortem usque pro injuria repensatum, quando vel una nox pauculis faculis largiter ultionis[6] posset operari, si malum malo dispungi penes nos liceret? Sed absit, ut aut igni humano vindicetur divinitas sectæ, aut doleat pati, in quo probatur. Si enim hostes exsertos, non tantum vindices occultos agere vellemus, deesset nobis vis numerorum[7] et copia-

CAP. XXXVII.

singular occasions for the exhibitions of their rage, but just the contrary, as Mr Evans himself remarks. Accordingly I would rather translate it, "Nay, with frantic rage, like that of the very orgies," &c. giving *ipsis* a force by no means unusual. *Jam alios, jam nec totos;* i. e. after they have become different beings, through death, from those who offended you; *nec totos* refers to the decomposition of the body.

[5] Constr: *Quid tamen unquam denotastis pro injuria repensatum* [vobis] *de tam conspiratis, tam ad mortem usque animatis* [nobis.] So presently *tam libentur trucidamur.*

[6] *largiter ultionis;* ἐκδικήσεως ἅδην, as Dr Ashton has noted in the margin. The *nox una cum faculis* alludes to the power which any single desperate individual had of setting fire to the city. In fact the Christians *were* made to bear the blame of Nero's conflagration, and were accused of burning the imperial palace at the time of Diocletian's persecution (Lact. M. P. 14). Any reader acquainted with the Roman Satirists will know how little need there was to search among the Christians for incendiaries. Compare on the argument S. Cypr. ad Demetr. c. 3.

[7] *numerorum et copiarum;* there is no doubt about the usage of these words (for *numeri* see Lips. ad Tac. Hist. I. 7.) as synonymous with *legiones*, but I think the context here shews that they are to be taken in the ordinary sense of 'multitudes.' *ipsi* is added to *Parthi* to make a climax of the sentence; and it may be remarked how emphatically from the Augustan age downwards the Parthians are always spoken of; Muretus observes (ad Tac. Ann. II. 2.) that *universus terrarum orbis in Romanos et Parthos divisus videbatur;* and the Parthian ambassadors assert of their nation (Ann. XII. 10.) *viribus æmulos, per reve-*

CAP. XXXVII. rum? Plures nimirum Mauri et Marcomanni ipsique Parthi, vel quantæcunque (unius tamen loci et suorum finium) gentes, quam totius orbis. Hesterni sumus et[8] vestra omnia inplevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum[9], forum; sola vobis reliquimus templa[10]. Cui bello non idonei, non prompti fuissemus, etiam impares copiis, qui tam libentur trucidamur, si non apud istam disciplinam magis occidi liceret, quam occidere? Potuimus et inermes, nec rebelles, sed tantummodo discordes, solius divortii invidia adversus vos dimicasse. Si enim tanta vis hominem in aliquem orbis remoti sinum abrupissemus a vobis, [11]suffu-

rentiam cessisse. Two curious speeches may be consulted in Lucan. VIII. 252—351.

[8] *et* v. ad c. 2. and for the argument ad c. 1.

[9] *senatum;* A very important record, or a very hazardous hyperbole, is contained in this single word. The construction of the sentence would lead us naturally to take its accumulated assertions with some restriction, especially with our knowledge of the author's habitual earnestness, but in this case we have other evidence to shew that the Christians could not be said *implesse senatum* while Tertullian was writing. The books of Prudentius against Symmachus, with the *Relatio Symmachi* and the reply of S. Ambrose will shew the state of things after a very considerable interval, and Mr Evans (Theol. Lib. XIV. 270.) has turned the biography of Apollonius into an essay on this subject as interesting and as original as his writings always are. Lactantius, writing more than a century after this, admits, and endeavours to explain, the fact. Inst. Div. v. 1.

[10] After this clause is inserted in some editions the following sentence: *Possumus dinumerare exercitus vestros; unius provinciæ plures erunt:* but as the evidence for its exclusion is at least as strong as that for its admission, and as it is not very apposite or very intelligible, I have omitted it. If genuine, the idea of Tertullian seems to be that the Christians of a single province would be a match for the standing army, something like the *Vix hostem, alterni si congrediamur, habemus.*

[11] *suffudisset.* v. ad c. 4. and

CAP. XXXVII.

disset utique dominationem vestram tot qualiumcunque amissio civium, imo etiam et ipsa destitutione punisset. Procul dubio expavissetis ad solitudinem vestram, ad silentium rerum et stuporem quendam quasi mortui orbis; quæsissetis[12] quibus imperaretis. Plures hostes quam cives vobis remansissent. Nunc enim pauciores hostes habetis præ multitudine Christianorum, pæne omnium civitatum pæne omnes cives Christianos habendo. Sed hostes maluistis[13] vocare generis humani. Quis autem vos ab illis occultis et usquequaque vastantibus mentes et valetudines vestras hostibus raperet? a dæmoniorum incursibus dico, quæ de vobis sine præmio, sine mercede depellimus. Suffecisset hoc solum nostræ ultioni, quod vacua exinde possessio immundis spiritibus pateretis. Porro nec tanti

for the expression *divortii invidia* ad c. 40.

[12] *quæsissetis;* i. e. nec invenissetis. This is a peculiar sense of *quæro*. So in Virgil Georg. III. 532.

> Tempore non alio dicunt regionibus illis
> Quæsitas ad sacra boves Junonis——.

and Æn. v. 814.

> Unus erit tantum, amissum quem gurgite quæret.

Compare Juv. VI. 333. In a precisely similar sense *desiderati* is technically applied to the soldiers *missing* after an engagement, as in Cæsar repeatedly. But, singularly enough, *quæro* has more frequently a signification exactly the reverse of this as Georg. IV. 157.

> —— in medium quæsita reponunt.

and Hor. Sat. I. 1. 38.

> ———— illis utitur ante
> Quæsitis sapiens ————

in which latter sense it is just equivalent to *reperio*. Compare Æn. VI. 610. Ter. Heaut. I. 1. 60. Hor. Ep. ad Pis. 170.

[13] *maluistis;* the idea implied in the word is that whereas the Romans had fair grounds for looking on the Christians as good citizens and friends, they deliberately *preferred* another view of the case, and considered them as public enemies. On the peculiar form of the argument in the succeeding passage, and on the inference to be drawn from it, I have spoken in the introduction, c. 3.

CAP. XXXVII.

præsidii compensationem cogitantes, non modo non molestum vobis genus, verum etiam necessarium, hostes judicare maluistis: qui sumus plane[14], non generis humani tamen, sed potius erroris.

We have not the qualities which make a faction dangerous.

XXXVIII. Proinde, nec paulo lenius, inter licitas factiones[1] sectam istam deputari oportebat, a qua nihil tale committitur, quale de illicitis factionibus timeri solet. Nisi fallor enim, prohibendarum factionum caussa de providentia constat modestiæ publicæ[2], ne civitas in partes scinderetur, quæ res facile comitia, concilia, curias, conciones, spectacula etiam æmulis studiorum compulsationibus[3] inquietaret, cum jam et in quæstu habere cœpissent venalem et mercenariam homines violentiæ suæ operam. At enim nobis ab omni gloriæ et dignitatis ardore frigentibus[4] nulla est necessitas

[14] *qui sumus plane;* the use of *plane* here is like that in c. 22; *et sunt plane malorum,* &c.

XXXVIII. [1] *Inter licitas factiones;* These *factiones* were companies, something like those existing at the present day, of various trades or craftsmen. Some were legalized and could possess property by charter; others appear to have been secretly formed for private purposes, and they were found as may very naturally be supposed, exceedingly injurious to legitimate rule and order. (Sueton. Aug. 32.) Against these ἑταιρεῖαι Trajan accordingly issued an edict, and so strong were his opinions on the subject, that when Pliny, after reporting a conflagration in his province, requested that a limited number of smiths should be formed into a kind of brigade to check the spread of such calamities in future, the emperor rejected the proposal, observing '*quodcunque nomen ex quacunque caussa dederimus iis, qui in idem contracti fuerint, hetæriæ quamvis breves* (short-lived, like *breves rosæ*) *fient.*' (x. 42, 43.) It was this edict that was subsequently enforced against the Christians, in compliance with which Pliny says (x. 97.), they discontinued their assemblies.

[2] *prohibendarum factionum caussa;* "The reason for prohibiting assemblies, lies in the care for public order," *providere* being like *prospicere.*

[3] *compulsationibus,* v. ad c. 20.

[4] *ab omni ardore frigentibus;* A

cœtus, nec ulla magis res aliena, quam publica. Unam omnium rempublicam agnoscimus, mundum. Æque spectaculis vestris in tantum renuntiamus, in quantum originibus eorum[5], quas scimus de superstitione conceptas, cum et ipsis rebus, de quibus transiguntur prætersumus. Nihil est nobis dictu, visu, auditu cum insania circi, cum impudicitia theatri, cum atrocitate arenæ, cum vanitate xysti[6]. Licuit Epicureis[7] aliquam decernere voluptatis veritatem. Quo vos offendimus, si alias præsumimus voluptates? Si oblectari novisse nolumus[8], nostra injuria est, si forte, non vestra. Sed reprobamus quæ placent vobis, nec vos nostra delectant. CAP. XXXVIII.

XXXIX. Edam jam nunc ego ipsa[1] negotia For listen, now, to our daily practices and habits.

more usual construction in earlier times would have been *ad omnem frigentibus* or *in*; in the present text there is a *notio abhorrendi* involved.

[5] *originibus eorum*; see this subject treated of at large in the tract *de Spectaculis*. *conceptas* in this sentence is like *etsi a Numa concepta est curiositas superstitiosa* in c. 25.

[6] *vanitate xysti*. i. e. philosophantium.

[7] *Licuit Epicureis*, &c. If the text and position of this clause be correct, the argument of Tertullian must be of this kind: We have no pleasure in your theatrical exhibitions; but you cannot consistently take offence on that score, for one of your own sects, the Epicureans, distinguished clearly between true and false enjoyments, and therefore when we, on this subject differ in opinion from yourselves (*alias præsumimus voluptates*, i. e. *alias opinamur atque vos ipsi*, see the notes, and especially Bentley's, on Hor. Serm. II. 3. 208.) why we do no more than they do, and ought not to excite your displeasure.

[8] *Si oblectari novisse nolumus*; this passage is variously read; in the text given *novisse* is by a very common use both of *scio* and *nescio*; another reading is *si oblectari novissime nolumus*, in which *novissime* must be equivalent to *denique*; and a third, *si oblectare nos vanissime nolumus*; both *oblectare* and *oblectamentum* are peculiarly used for pastimes of any kind.

XXXIX. [1] *ipsa negotia*; "the real proceedings," as opposed to the calumnies of the day. In the term *factionis* Tertullian is probably adopting the language of

CAP. XXXIX. Christianæ factionis, ut qui mala refutaverim, bona ostendam. Corpus sumus de conscientia religionis et disciplinæ divinitate et spei fœdere. Coimus in cœtum et congregationem, ut ad deum, quasi manu facta[2], precationibus ambiamus. Hæc vis deo grata
Just. 87. est. Oramus etiam pro imperatoribus, pro ministeriis eorum ac potestatibus[3], pro statu seculi, pro rerum quiete, pro mora finis[4]. Cogimur[5] ad litterarum divinarum commemorationem, si quid præsentium temporum qualitas aut præmonere cogit aut recognoscere. Certe fidem sanctis vocibus pasci-

his adversaries. *Corpus sumus de*, &c.; "the bond and principles of our union are," &c. *Corpus* is frequently used for a 'society,' 'corporation.' In the official letters of Licinius (Lact. M. P. 48) it is stated, '*Quoniam iidem Christiani non ea loca tantum ad quæ convenire consueverunt, sed alia etiam habuisse noscuntur, ad jus corporis eorum, id est Ecclesiarum, non hominum singulorum pertinentia, ea omnia*, &c. *conscientia religionis* is either *communio sententiarum* or *quod sibi quisque eadem de religione conscit; disciplinæ divinitas* is like *divinitas sectæ*, &c., and the *spei fœdus* is the bond of union which all have for their common hope of a resurrection.

[2] *quasi manu facta;* this, like many in Tertullian's writings, is a military expression, and with reference to it the *hæc vis* is used just after; *collatis precibus adoramus*, says Arnobius I. 14. the whole of which passage may be compared.

[3] *pro potestatibus eorum;* this is the Vulgate translation of ἐξουσίαις. Arnobius (II. 32) speaks of *tyrannos, dominos, alias innumeras potestates*. Juvenal uses the same expression.

Fidenarum Gabiorumque esse potestas.
x. 100.

and so in modern Italian, *podestà*.

[4] Some readings omit here the words *pro statu*, so that *sæculi* depends on *potestatibus*, but I prefer the text as given above. See for the argument c. 32. In either case *sæculum* will have the sense noticed at the conclusion of the note p. 103. *pro mora finis*, emphatically, τὸ τέλος. So in the Vulgate S. Marc. XIII. 7. oportet enim hæc fieri, sed nondum finis.

[5] *Cogimur;* i. e. colligimur, coimus. *certe fidem*, &c. "at all events"; i.e. even if the aspect of the times offers no special subject of consideration; and to this must refer the *nihilominus* below, if the reading *inculcationibus* is correct.

mus, spem erigimus, fiduciam figimus, disciplinam præceptorum nihilominus inculcationibus densamus; ibidem etiam exhortationes, castigationes et censura divina[6]. Nam et judicatur magno cum pondere, ut apud certos de dei conspectu, summumque futuri judicii præjudicium est, si quis ita deliquerit, ut a communicatione orationis et conventus et omnis sancti commercii relegetur. Præsident probati quique seniores, honorem istum non pretio, sed testimonio adepti: neque enim pretio ulla res dei constat. Etiam si quod arcæ genus est[7], non de honoraria summa, quasi redemptæ religionis congregatur; modicam unusquisque stipem menstrua die, vel quum velit, et si modo velit et si modo possit, apponit: nam nemo compellitur, sed sponte confert. Hæc quasi deposita pietatis sunt. Nam inde non epulis, nec potaculis, nec ingratis voratrinis dispensatur, sed egenis alendis humandisque, et pueris ac puellis re ac parentibus destitutis, jamque domesticis senibus[8], item naufragis, et si qui in metallis, et si qui in insulis, vel in custodiis, duntaxat ex caussa dei sectæ, alumni[9] confessionis CAP. XXXIX.

[6] v. ad Cor. i. 6. ad Tim. i. 3.

[7] *etiam si quid arcæ genus est,* &c. the *etiam* refers to the utter repudiation of any thing like *pretium* in the previous clause; "Even," says Tertullian, "the kind of common chest which we keep, is not filled or made up (*congregatur*) of any fixed sums, given as a kind of consideration-money for the religious privileges (*quasi redemtæ religionis*) but each individual," &c. The *apponit* a little below may be perhaps *quasi Deo,* or it may be simply *ponit. deposita,* like our derivative, was applied specially to sums of money entrusted to a friend and left in his care. See Juv. Sat. XIII. Possibly there may be some allusion to the text *Fæneratur Domino qui miseretur pauperis.*

[8] *jamque domesticis senibus,* i.e. ac senibus qui jam foras prodire nequeant.

[9] *alumni confessionis suæ;* this appears to me a most remarkable expression, though no commen-

CAP. XXXIX.

suæ fiunt. Sed ejusmodi vel maxime dilectionis operatio notam nobis inurit[10] penes quosdam. Vide, inquiunt, ut invicem se diligant: ipsi enim invicem oderunt; et ut pro alterutro mori sint parati: ipsi enim ad occidendum alterutrum paratiores erunt. Sed et quod fratrum appellatione[11] censemur, non alias, opinor, infamant, quam quod apud ipsos omnes sanguinis nomen de affectatione simulatum est. Fratres autem etiam vestri sumus, jure naturæ matris unius, etsi vos parum homines, quia mali fratres. At quanto dignius fratres et dicuntur et habentur, qui unum patrem deum agnoverunt, qui unum spiritum biberunt sanctitatis, qui de uno utero ignorantiæ ejusdem ad unam lucem[12] expaverunt veritatis. Sed eo fortasse minus legitimi

tator that I have seen takes the slightest notice of it. *alumni insularum ex* (or, as Tertullian would say, *de*) *confessione sua* would be natural enough, but this must mean: "and to such as in the mines or islands (v. ad c. 1.) become the nurslings of their confession," or "suffer such penalties as their confession has brought on them;" *confessio* being taken (like *confessor* often) in the peculiar sense of a confession of faith persisted in under torture; the only other possible construction which I can see is even harsher and more inexplicable, viz. to join *alumni in insulis*, &c. and leave *confessionis* to depend on some ellipse. *custodia* is here *carcer;* but see p. 34.

[10] *notam nobis inurit;* so de Hab. Mul. c. 4. *Nulla nunc muliebri pompæ nota inusta sit*, &c. Lactantius (de M. P. 3.) *etiam mortuo notam inureret.* On the assertion of Tertullian see Lucian de Morte Pereg. VIII. p. 280, ed. Bipont. *operatio* is the putting into practice.

[11] *sed et quod*, &c.; the construction and the sense are as follows: *sed et* (insuper etiam) *quod censemur fratrum appellatione* (fraternum inter nos nomen) *non alias infamant* (aggrediuntur nulla alia de causa) *quam quod*, &c.

[12] *ad unam lucem*, &c. I have no idea that Tertullian is here alluding to any particular occurrence; the expression *ex utero in lucem* is clear enough (like *partu sub luminis edidit auras*), and so is the metaphor, (compare Arnob. IV. 15. *creditis ex seminis jactu ignoratam sibi ad lucem beneficiis*

CAP. XXXIX.

existimamur, quia nulla de nostra fraternitate tragœdia exclamat[13], vel quia ex substantia familiari fratres sumus, quæ penes vos fere dirimit fraternitatem. Itaque qui animo animaque miscemur, nihil de rei communicatione dubitamus. Omnia indiscreta sunt apud nos, præter uxores: in isto loco consortium solvimus, in quo solo ceteri homines consortium exercent, qui non amicorum solummodo matrimonia usurpant, sed et sua amicis patientissime subministrant, ex illa, credo, majorum et sapientissimorum disciplina, Græci Socratis et Romani Catonis, qui uxores suas amicis communicaverunt, quas in matrimonium duxerant[14] liberorum caussa et alibi creandorum, nescio quidem an invitas; quid enim de castitate curarent, quam mariti tam facile donaverant[15]? O sapientiæ At-

obscœnitatis exisse), while nothing is more common than to speak of the periods preceding and following conversion, as those of darkness and light respectively. So Arnobius again (II. 57.) *Nondum enim affulserat qui viam monstraret errantibus et caligine in altissime constitutis cognitionis lumen immitteret, et ignorationis discuteret cæcitatem.* The phrases are of course, originally, scriptural.

[13] *tragœdia exclamat.* The allusion specially is to Eteocles and Polynices; but the proverbial expressions like *fraterna odia*, &c. are well known. In the *ex substantia familiari* the *ex* answers precisely to the *de* at the commencement of the chapter *corpus sumus de*, &c. The irony of the following passage can scarcely be surpassed.

[14] I have not put any stop after *duxerant*, because I would rather have *caussa* joined closely with that word, than with *communicaverunt;* so that *et alibi* is ironically inserted, meaning of course, besides *domi.*

[15] *donaverant.* There is a peculiar force about this word implying the absolute command of the donor over the thing offered, and a careless readiness in making the offer without any return expected. v. c. 50. There is a good example in Lucan, II. 474.

——dumque ipse ad bella vocaret,
Donavit socero Romani sanguinis usum.

Tertullian has confounded the major and minor Cato.

CAP. XXXIX.

ticæ, o Romanæ gravitatis exemplum! Leno est philosophus et censor. Quid ergo mirum[16], si tanta caritas convivatur? Nam et cœnulas nostras, præterquam sceleris infames, ut prodigas quoque suggillatis. De nobis scilicet Diogenis dictum est[17]: Megarenses obsonant quasi crastina die morituri, ædificant vero quasi nunquam morituri. Sed stipulam quis in alieno oculo facilius perspicit, quam in suo trabem. Tot tribubus et curiis et decuriis ructantibus acescit aër. Saliis cœnaturis creditor erit necessarius. Herculanarum[18] decimarum et polluctorum sumptus tabularii supputabunt; Apaturiis, Dionysiis, mysteriis Atticis coquorum delectus[19] indicentur. Ad fumum cœnæ Serapiacæ sparteoli excitabuntur. De solo triclinio Christianorum retractatur[20]. Cœna nostra de nomine rationem sui ostendit; id vocatur, quod dilectio

[16] *Quid ergo mirum, &c.* Tertullian here seems to return to the serious argument which he left above, and to continue thus: considering then, that our mutual love (*caritas*) is such as I describe, what is there wonderful in the fact of our occasionally taking our meals together? I mention this because (*nam*) you calumniate our frugal supper (*cœnulas*) as both wicked and extravagant.

[17] This saying has also been attributed to Empedocles of the Agrigentines, and to Stratonicus of the Rhodians.

[18] Macrobius Satur. III. 12. *Testatur Terentius Varro in ea satira quæ inscribitur περὶ κεραυνοῦ majores solitos decimam Herculi vovere, nec decem dies intermittere quin pollucerent, ac populum ἀσύμβολον cum corona laurea dimitterent ad cubitum.*

[19] *delectus.* "A levy of cooks must be proclaimed"—*sparteoli;* "firemen"—Vid. Casaub. ad Sueton. Aug. 30. and Rup. ad Juv. XIV. 305. *major fumus ex lautorum culinis terrare vigiles solet,* says Seneca, Ep. 64. The character and style of these few sentences are worthy remarking; the reader might almost imagine he was perusing some sharp review of the present day.

[20] *retractatur;* "all this passes without notice, nothing is called to account but the supper of the Christians."

penes Græcos. Quantiscunque sumptibus constet, lucrum est pietatis nomine facere sumptum, siquidem inopes quosque refrigerio isto juvamus, non qua[21] penes vos parasiti affectant ad gloriam famulandæ libertatis sub auctoramento ventris inter contumelias saginandi, sed qua penes deum major est contemplatio mediocrium. Si honesta caussa est convivii, reliquum ordinem disciplinæ æstimate, qui sit, de religionis officio: nihil vilitatis[22], nihil immodestiæ admittit; non prius discumbitur, quam oratio ad deum prægustetur; editur quantum esurientes capiunt; bibitur quantum pudicis est utile. Ita saturantur, ut qui meminerint etiam per noctem adorandum deum sibi esse; ita fabulantur, ut qui sciant dominum audire. Post aquam manualem[23] et lumina, ut quisque de scripturis sanctis vel de proprio ingenio potest, provocatur in medium deo canere; hinc probatur quomodo biberit. Æque oratio convivium dirimit. Inde disceditur non in catervas cæsionum[24], neque in classes discursati-

[21] *non qua,* &c. Constr.: *Non qua* (sc. ratione. Æn. I. 675.) *penes vos parasiti affectant* (sc. viam. v. Stallbaum ad Ter. Heaut. II. 3. 60.) *ad gloriam famulandæ libertatis sub auctoramento, ...sed qua,* &c. *auctoramento,* Gloss. vet. '*auctoratus*' ὁ πρὸς σίδηρον πραθεὶς. v. Hor. Sat. II. 7. 59. *auctoramentum* was the hire or wage for which a person thus bound himself. *auctoro* and *auctoror* (dep.) are used by Tertullian and Apuleius, but seldom earlier. On the argument see the fifth satire of Juvenal.

[22] *nihil vilitatis;* this is not a common usage of *vilitas,* which in earlier authors seldom or never occurs without reference to *pretium,* but there is a parallel instance in Apuleius, Florid. I. 7. 3. where he speaks of *vilitas morum,* meaning *turpitudo.* Ammianus (XIV. 6.) uses it for a disgraceful story, and Ducange in his glossary gives a single instance of its occurrence for *ignavia.*

[23] *post aquam manualem,* v. de Oratione, c. 11.

[24] *catervæ cæsionum,* i. e. quæ obvios quosque cædunt. I cannot

CAP. XXXIX.

onum, nec in eruptiones lasciviarum, sed ad eandem curam[25] modestiæ et pudicitiæ, ut qui non tam cœnam cœnaverint, quam disciplinam. Hæc coitio Christianorum merito sane illicita, si illicitis par, merito damnanda, si quis de ea queritur eo titulo, quo de factionibus querela est. In cujus perniciem aliquando convenimus? Hoc sumus congregati, quod et dispersi, hoc universi, quod et singuli, neminem lædentes, neminem contristantes. Quum probi, quum boni coeunt, quum pii, quum casti congregantur, non est factio dicenda, sed curia[26].

You accuse us of all the troubles which now harass the empire: Can you trace no such events before *we* appeared amongst you?

XL. At e contrario illis nomen factionis accommodandum est, qui in odium bonorum et proborum conspirant, qui adversum sanguinem innocentium conclamant, prætexentes sane ad odii defensionem illam quoque vanitatem[1], quod existiment omnis publicæ cladis, omnis popularis incommodi Christianos esse in caussa. Si Tiberis ascendit in mœnia, si Nilus non ascendit in arva, si cœlum stetit[2], si terra movit, si fames, si lues, statim,

Ad Nat. I. 9.

find an instance of *cæsio* in this sense elsewhere, though it occurs for *putatio* in Columella.

The practices alluded to are familiar to all readers. See the end of Juv. Sat. III. Perhaps Apuleius too was thinking of his native country when he thus writes of Hypata; *vesana factio nobilissimorum juvenum pacem publicam infecit, et passim trucidatos per medias plateas videbis jacere.*

[25] *eandem curam* means: the same care that was taken before the meeting. A little below *titulus* is as in c. 1. "if any one can bring such charges against it as are brought," &c.

[26] Sallust. B. J. c. 31. *Hæc inter bonos amicitia, inter malos factio est.*

XL. [1] *vanitas.* i. e. mendacium; de Resur. Car. c. 2. *adversus phantasmatis vanitatem.* So Cic. Off. I. 42. Vell. Paterc. II. 60. On the argument v. c. 20, and compare especially the opening of S. Aug. de Civ. Dei, and of the Disputationes of Arnobius.

[2] *Si cœlum stetit.* There are several passages in which the sky

CAP. XL.

Christianos ad leonem! Tantos ad unum? Oro vos, ante Tiberium, id est ante Christi adventum, quantæ clades orbem et urbem ceciderunt? Legimus Hieran, Anaphen et Delon et Rhodon et Co insulas multis cum millibus hominum pessum abiisse[3]. Memorat et Plato majorem Asiæ et Africæ terram Atlantico mari ereptam. Sed et mare Corinthium terræ motus ebibit, et vis undarum Lucaniam Italiæ abscissam in Siciliæ nomen relegavit. Hæc utique non sine injuria incolentium accidere potuerunt. Ubi vero tunc, non dicam deorum vestrorum contemptores Christiani[4], sed ipsi dii vestri, cum totum ordem cataclysmus abolevit[5], vel ut Plato putavit, campestre solummodo?

is said *stare pulvere*, &c. and *stare* is also applied to the stagnation of a fountain or river, (*stabant profluvia sanguinis*, Arnob. I. 25.) but I have no doubt but that Tertullian here, in his peculiar fondness for antithesis has purposely used the exact opposite to *movit*, without thinking of its precise applicability. It simply means *stagnavit, nullos imbres demisit*. In the tract de Jejuniis, c. 16. the expression is *cum stupet cœlum*. The Vulgate in Reg. II. 8. 35. has *Si clausum fuerit cœlum et non pluerit propter peccata eorum*, which corresponds to the *cataractæ cœli apertæ sunt*. Gen. vii. 11.

[3] *pessum abiisse*. v. Wakefield ad Lucret. VI. 589. *ceciderunt* in the sentence above is equivalent to *straverunt*, Cf. Hor. Car. III. 6. 35. *orbem et urbem* is *Romam atque mundum*.

[4] Tertullian here introduces an argument cursorily; he is simply going to prove that when these misfortunes (far greater than those of the then present day) took place, there were no Christians to despise the gods, and by this contempt to invoke their anger. But from this remark he catches at another point and says, "Where were your gods themselves?" for the cities in which they were born being posterior to this universal deluge, so must they necessarily be too; this reasoning he pursues for awhile, returning to the original argument at *semper humana gens*, &c.

[5] *abolevit totum orbem; orbis* is here taken in the sense of *genus humanum* as frequently or rather of *genus animantum*, including too their works, habitations, &c.

CAP. XL.

Posteriores enim illos clade diluvii contestantur ipsæ urbes, in quibus nati mortuique sunt, etiam quas condiderunt; neque enim alias in hodiernum manerent, nisi et ipsæ postumæ cladis illius. Nondum Judæum ab Ægypto examen Palæstina susceperat, nec jam illic Christianæ sectæ origo consederat, quum regiones affines ejus Sodoma et Gomorra igneus imber exussit. Olet adhuc incendio terra, et si qua illic arborum poma conantur, oculis tenus, ceterum contacta cinerescunt[6]. Sed nec Tuscia jam tunc atque Campania de Christianis querebatur, quum Volsinios de cœlo, Tarpeios de suo monte perfudit ignis. Nemo adhuc Romæ deum verum adorabat, cum Annibal apud Cannas Romanos annulos, cædes suas, modio metiebatur. Omnes dii vestri ab omnibus colebantur, cum ipsum Capitolium Senones occupaverunt. Et bene, quod

[6] There are various readings of this passage. If the text is correct the construction is: *Si illic qua arborum* (i. e. arbores ullæ) *conantur poma* (sc. edere) *oculis tenus* (ea conantur, non tactu); *ceterum*, &c. Tacitus (Hist. v. 7.) says *cuncta sponte edita aut manu sata, sive herbæ tenues aut flores ut solitam in speciem adolevere, atra et inusta velut in cinerem vanescunt.* The author of the short poem entitled Sodoma has copied the phraseology of Tertullian as well as the legends of Tacitus.

Semiperemta etiam si qua illic jugera lætas
Auctumni conantur opes . . . . .

This poem together with one called Genesis is frequently printed in editions of Cyprian, to whom it is, with some uncertainty, ascribed. It has been conjectured that the two pieces are both fragments of a metrical version of the Old Testament, which does not seem improbable. The peculiar Latinity of Tertullian has been so industriously transferred to these poems (especially the former) that they look almost like scholastic compositions after a model. Yet I should rather assign them to Cyprian on the whole. They shew that inattention to quantity which Commodianus carried out (at least if he meant to write poetry at all), and which even Prudentius is not free from.

si[7] quid adversi accidit urbibus, eædem clades templorum quæ et mœnium fuerunt; ut jam hoc revincam, non a deis evenire, quia et ipsis evenit. Semper humana gens male de deo meruit: primo quidem ut inofficiosa[8] ejus, quem cum intelligeret ex parte, non solum non requisivit timendum[9], sed et alios sibi citius commenta est quos coleret; dehinc quod non inquirendo innocentiæ magistrum[10], et nocentiæ judicem et exactorem, omnibus vitiis et criminibus inolevit[11]. Ceterum si requisisset, sequebatur ut recognosceret requisitum, et recognitum observaret, et observatum magis propitium experiretur quam iratum. Eundem ergo nunc quoque scire debet iratum, quem et retro semper, priusquam Christiani nominarentur. Cujus bonis utebatur ante editis, quam deos sibi fin- CAP. XL.

[7] *et bene, quod si,* &c. This expression is often used by Tertullian; so ad fin. c. 24. *bene, quod omnium deus est.* It here means: that the circumstance presently related concerning these misfortunes is a very fortunate one for the argument. S. Augustine in the opening of the Civitas Dei repeats the reasoning.

[8] *inofficiosa,* sc. officii negligens, v. ad c. 23. Cicero uses *officiosus* in a good sense; *nec diligentiorem, nec officiosiorem, nec nostri studiosiorem facile delegissem* ad Att. XIII. 45.

[9] *non requisivit timendum;* i. e. did not so investigate and embody His existence, as to propose Him to themselves as an object of fear and dread. Compare the use of the same word in c. 23. *superiorum sine dubio et timendorum.*

[10] *innocentiæ magistrum,* &c. *magister* here means *doctor* or *revelator;* see c. 45. *innocentiam a Deo edocti et perfecte eam novimus, ut a perfecto magistro revelatam, et fideliter custodimus ut ab incontemptibili dispectore mandatam.* In the next clause *exactorem* is either an interpolation, or it must be taken in the sense of *exsecutorem* (see note p. 10.) as Tacitus says Agricola was used *omnia scire, non omnia exsequi.* Tertullian himself speaks of God as *innocentiæ exactor,* de Spect. c. 2.

[11] *inolevit;* "grew up in, got rooted in." Æn. VI. 738. Georg. II. 77.

CAP. XL.

geret, cur non ab eo etiam mala intelligat evenire, cujus bona esse non sensit? Illius rea est, cujus et ingrata. Et tamen si pristinas clades comparemus, leviora nunc accidunt, ex quo Christianos a deo orbis accepit. Ex eo enim et innocentia seculi iniquitates temperavit, et deprecatores dei esse cœperunt. Denique cum ab imbribus æstiva hiberna suspendunt[12] et annus in cura est, vos quidem, quotidie pasti statimque pransuri, balneis et cauponis et lupanaribus operati, aquilicia[13] Jovi immolatis, nudipedalia populo denuntiatis, cœlum apud Capitolum quæritis, nubila de laquearibus exspectatis[14], aversi ab ipso et deo et cœlo. Nos vero jejuniis aridi et omni continentia expressi, ab omni vitæ fruge dilati[15], in sacco et

[12] *ab imbribus æstiva hiberna suspendunt;* Towards the explanation of this expression we have first two passages in Cyprian, *quando imbrem nubila serena suspendunt;* de Mort. c. 2. and *quod imbres et pluvias serena longa suspendant;* ad Demetr. præf. From this it is quite clear that *suspendere* is equivalent to *retinere,* like *ictum suspendere,* &c. (compare Virg. Georg. I. 214.) Next from a passage in Seneca Quæst. Nat. III. 27. (which Dr Ashton has marked in the margin) *elisa æstate, hiems pertinax immensam vim aquarum ruptis nubibus deruat,* it appears that *æstas* and *hiems* were taken for the dry and wet seasons respectively, and therefore the meaning of the text seems to be, "when the summer droughts (prolonged) keep off the winter rains."

[13] *aquilicia.* Festus: *Aquælicium dicitur cum aqua pluvialis remediis quibusdam elicitur, et quondam, si creditur, manali lapide* (quod aquos manare faceret) *in urbem ducto,* v. Scalig. ad loc.

[14] *cœlum apud Cap. quæritis, nubila de laquearibus exspectatis;* to the circumstances here referred to, Tertullian also alludes in c. 24. *alius nubes numeret orans, alius lacunaria.*

[15] *expressi;* this word implies the dry and shrivelled condition which fasting and self-mortification will produce, and is exactly equivalent to the phrase *spongia expressa* which Celsus so frequently employs. See Matthiæ's index, ed. 4to. Lugd. Bat. 1785. *dilati,* i. e. distantes, abstinentes. *invidia cœlum tundimus.* v. Intpp. ad Juv. xv. 123. *invidiam alicui facere* strictly means 'to set a

cinere volutantes, invidia cœlum tundimus, deum tangimus, et cum misericordiam extorserimus, Jupiter honoratur a vobis, Deus negligitur.

CAP. XL.

XLI. Vos igitur importuni rebus humanis, vos rei publicorum incommodorum, vos malorum illices[1] semper, apud quos deus spernitur, statuæ adorantur. Utique enim credibilius haberi debet, eum irasci qui negligatur, quam qui coluntur: aut næ illi iniquissimi, si propter Christianos etiam cultores suos lædunt, quos separare deberent a meritis Christianorum. Hoc, inquitis, et in deum vestrum repercutere est, qui et ipse patiatur propter profanos etiam cultores suos lædi. Admittite prius dispositiones[2] ejus, et non retorquebitis. Qui enim semel æternum judicium destinavit post seculi finem, non præcipitat discretionem[3], quæ est con-

You, in truth, are the guilty parties.

person in an odious light.' Liv. xxxvii. 57. *in hujus maxime invidiam desistere se Glabrio dixit;* but it is often used particularly to express such a demeanour in a suppliant as places the person appealed to in an invidious situation if he refuses. The author of *Sodoma,* in line 21, *Pulsabant cœlum invidia connubia mixta,* has either mistaken the phrase, or employed it very unusually; *tundere* like *pulsare* merely strengthens the expression. Compare the use of the word in c. 37. *solius divortii invidia.*

XLI. [1] *illices malorum.* So *illices oculi* and *conversationem misericordiæ illicem* de Pœn. c. 9. The verb is used by Lucretius.

[2] *dispositiones.* v. ad c. 11. *semel utique in ista constructione dispositum et instructum et ordinatum* (hoc mundi corpus) *inventum est.* The argument of this passage is very often urged by Arnobius; e. g. II. 60. *nihil Deum cogebat necessarias temporum non expectare mensuras. Rationibus fixis peraguntur res ejus et quod semel decretum est fieri, nulla potest novitate mutari.* Compare too, the following chapter of that book with the present text.

[3] *non præcipitat discretionem;* i. e. "does not prematurely hurry on that separation of the good from the bad which is ordained to take place at the last day." S. Matth. xxv. 32. *separabit eos ab invicem sicut pastor segregat oves ab hædis,* and xiii. 49. *Sic*

CAP. XLI.

ditio judicii, ante seculi finem. Æqualis est interim super omne hominum genus et indulgens et increpans[4]; communia voluit esse et commoda profanis et incommoda suis, ut pari consortio omnes et lenitatem ejus et severitatem experiremur. Quia hæc ita didicimus apud ipsum, diligimus lenitatem, metuimus severitatem, vos contra utramque despicitis: et sequiter, ut omnes seculi plagæ nobis, si forte, in admonitionem, vobis in castigationem a deo obveniant. Atquin nos nullo modo lædimur: imprimis quia nihil nostra refert in hoc ævo, nisi de eo quam celeriter excedere[5]; dehinc[6] quia si quid adversi infligitur, vestris id meritis deputatur. Sed etsi aliqua nos quoque perstringunt ut vobis cohærentes[7], lætamur magis recognitione divinarum prædicationum, confirmantium scilicet fiduciam et fidem spei nostræ. Si vero ab eis quos colitis omnia vobis mala eveniunt nostri caussa, quid colere perseveratis tam ingratos, tam injustos, qui magis vos in dolorem Christianorum juvare et asserere debuerant[8]?

erit in consummatione seculi, exibunt angeli, et separabunt malos de medio justorum.

[4] *Æqualis est interim.* S. Matth. v. 45.

[5] S. Paulus ad Coloss. iii. 2.

[6] *imprimis......dehinc:* So in the preceding chapter *primo quidem ut inofficiosa......dehinc quod non,* &c. The more usual phraseology in earlier Latin would be *primo......deinde.*

[7] c. 31. *cum enim concutitur imperium, utique et nos in aliquo loco casus invenimur.* S. Cyprian has urged this argument to his impatient brethren, de Mort. c. 2. and to the taunting heathens ad Demetr. c. 4. very forcibly in either case.

[8] *qui magis vos,* &c. I think Tertullian has here used *asserere,* absolutely for *asserere manu,* or *asserere in libertatem,* and in the general sense of *defendere,* although I cannot quote an instance of a parallel expression. Arnobius (I. 11.) has *Dii, nisi vestra fuerint assertione protecti, idonei non sunt qui valeant,* &c. and *assertor* in

CAP. XLII.

Further, you accuse us of being worthless in the ordinary transactions of life.

XLII. Sed alio quoque injuriarum titulo postulamur, et infructuosi in negotiis dicimur. Quo pacto[1] homines vobiscum degentes, ejusdem victus, habitus, instructus, ejusdem ad vitam necessitatis? Neque enim Brachmanæ aut Indorum gymnosophistæ sumus, silvicolæ et exules vitæ. Meminimus gratiam nos debere deo domino creatori; nullum fructum operum ejus repudiamus; plane temperamus, ne ultra modum aut perperam utamur. Itaque non sine foro, non sine macello, non sine balneis, tabernis, officinis, stabulis, nundinis vestris, ceterisque commerciis cohabitamus in hoc seculo. Navigamus et nos vobiscum[2] et militamus, et rusticamur, et mercamur; proinde[3] miscemus artes, operas nostras publicamus usui vestro. Quomodo infructuosi videamur negotiis vestris, cum quibus et de quibus vivimus, non scio. Sed si ceremonias tuas non frequento; attamen et illa die homo sum[4]. Non lavo sub noctem Saturnalibus, ne et noctem

the simple sense of *defensor* occurs both in this writer and Lactantius. *in dolorem Christianorum* is equivalent to *quo Christiani doleant.* nempe '*consecutis vobis quod optastis*' as c. 49. extr.

XLII. On the general argument of this chapter, see Neander's Ch. Hist. p. 304. sqq. Vol. I. Mr Rose's translation.

[1] *Quo pacto;* sc. infructuosi esse possumus.

[2] *vobiscum;* i. e. itidem ac vos. v. Heyne ad Virg. Ecl. II. 12. though it may be taken in the ordinary way.

[3] *proinde;* i. e. *pariter,* as frequently before in this treatise, in c. 9. it is answered by *quemadmodum. miscere artes,* I conceive means *in medium conferre,* to take advantage of another's handicraft, and make public your own.

[4] *et illa die homo sum;* i. e. I exist, as a man, like yourselves, and require all the necessaries of life; and to these I apply the produce of your hands if I do not to sacrificial ceremonies. If I purchase your commodities what signifies it to you how I use them?

CAP. XLII.

et diem perdam; attamen lavo et debita hora et salubri, quæ mihi et calorem et sanguinem servet; rigere et pallere[5] post lavacrum mortuus possum. Non in publico Liberalibus discumbo, quod bestiariis supremam[6] cœnantibus mos est; attamen ubiubi de copiis tuis cœno. Non emo capiti coronam. Quid tua interest, emptis nihilominus floribus quomodo utar? puto gratius liberis et solutis et undique vagis; sed etsi in coronam coactis, nos coronam naribus novimus, viderint qui per capillum odorantur[7]. Spectaculis non convenimus; quæ tamen apud illos cœtus venditantur si desideravero, libentius de suis locis sumam. Thura plane non emimus; si Arabiæ queruntur, scient Sabæi pluris et carioris suas merces Christianis sepeliendis profligari[8], quam diis fumigandis. Certe, inquitis, templorum vectigalia quotidie decoquunt[9], stipes

[5] *rigere et pallere.* The Saturnalia fell in December, and Tertullian says: I do not certainly keep your festival by a cold bath in the middle of winter, for it would but make me cold and pale, and that my last bath of all will do for me.

[6] *supremam cœnantibus.* See the commentators on Juv. XI. 20. and the saying of Diogenes in c. 39, and compare too a curious chapter of Livy XXVI. 14, together with Tacitus (Ann. II. 31.), who speaking of the remarkable proceedings in Libo's case, says that the accused *ipsis quas in novissimam voluptatem adhibuerat epulis excruciatus* implored death at the hands of his slaves; *ubiubi* means in some place or other, if not in the streets (*in publico*).

[7] See this argument carried out *de Corona militis.* Lucian too in Nigrino, I. p. 54. ed. Bip. ᾐτιᾶτο τῶν στεφανουμένων ὅτι μὴ ἴσασι τοῦ στεφάνου τὸν τόπον. εἰ γάρ τοι, ἔφη, τῇ πνοῇ τῶν ἴων τε καὶ ῥόδων χαίρουσιν ὑπὸ τῇ ῥινὶ μάλιστα ἐχρῆν αὐτοὺς στέφεσθαι. On the expression *novimus* see ad fin. c. 38.

[8] The same complaint is urged by Pliny to Trajan; but the peculiar satire of Tertullian's reply is worth noticing.

[9] *decoquunt;* 'are dwindling away.' This is generally an active verb, but it is used neutrally by Seneca and by Florus, (Procem. extr.) where see the sub-

quotusquisque jam jactat. Non [enim] sufficimus et hominibus et diis vestris mendicantibus opem ferre, nec putamus aliis quam petentibus impertiendum. Denique porrigat manum Jupiter et accipiat, cum interim plus nostra misericordia insumit vicatim, quam vestra religio templatim. Sed cetera vectigalia gratias Christianis agent ex fide dependentibus debitum, qua alieno fraudando abstinemus, ut, si ineatur quantum publico[10] pereat fraude et mendacio vestrarum professionum, facile ratio haberi possit, unius speciei querela compensata pro[11] commodo ceterarum rationum.

CAP. XLII.

XLIII. Plane confitebor, quinam, si forte, vere de sterilitate[1] Christianorum conqueri possint. Primi erunt lenones, perductores[2], aquarioli, tum

We are worthless to none but the bad, and even this deficiency we compensate otherwise.

ject discussed in Duker's note. There can be no doubt, I think, of its neutral use, although from the passage in Pliny there cited (xxxiii. 47.) compared with that from Seneca (Ep. 36.), which was overlooked, *decoquere creditoribus* appears to have been an ordinary expression for becoming insolvent, (see the Excerpt. Senecæ) where there is probably an ellipse of some accusative. With the words *pluris et carioris* compare Pliny H. N. xii. 41. "*acervatim congesta honori cadaverum quæ Diis per singulas micas dantur.*"

[10] *quantum publico pereat; publico* is a dative and is used elliptically as is *alieno;* the *professiones* of which Tertullian here speaks are almost exactly what we express by our derivative, in the same way as *profiteri artem* or *scientiam aliquam* is found.

[11] *compensata pro commodo;* I agree with Dr Ashton that either *pro* should be struck out, or it should be changed to *cum,* as Tertullian himself speaks in the next chapter. The sense is: 'a decrease in one item being set against an improvement in all the others.'

XLIII. [1] *sterilitas;* the meaning is, the unproductiveness of the Christians in commercial or pecuniary matters, like the *amicus sterilis* in Juvenal. xii. 96.

[2] *perductores; perducere* is often used in this peculiar sense. v. Ern. ad Tac. Hist. i. 25. and add the examples Plaut. Asin. i. 3. 12. Sueton. Tiber. c. 45. Calig. c. 25. *venenarii,* these professed poisoners are frequently mentioned under the emperors. *aquarioli;* "*Ita dicebantur mulierum*

CAP. XLIII. sicarii, venenarii, magi, item harioli, haruspices, mathematici. His infructuosos esse magnus fructus est. Et tamen quodcunque dispendium est rei vestræ per hanc sectam, cum aliquo utique præsidio compensari potest. Quanti habetis, non dico qui jam[3] de vobis dæmonia excutiant, non dico jam qui pro vobis quoque vero deo preces sternant, quia forte non creditis[4], sed a quibus nihil timere possitis.

The *real* detriment to the state, viz. your systematic injustice, no one considers.

XLIV. At enim illud detrimentum reipublicæ tam grande quam verum nemo circumspicit, illam injuriam civitatis nullus expendit, quum tot justi impendimur[1], quum tot innocentes erogamur[2]. Vestros enim jam contestamur actus, qui quotidie judicandis custodiis præsidetis, qui sententiis elogia

impudicarum sordidi assecla," Festus; a note of Salmasius ad Hist. Aug. II. p. 864. will give almost every apposite passage. Compare Apuleius. Apol. 526. *mathematici*, v. ad Juv. VI. 562. Tiberius and Vitellius both attached the penalty of exile to this profession.

[3] *non dico qui jam;* some MSS. transpose the two latter words, and they do appear then better to answer the following clause; but there are repeated instances to be found of such involution. *preces sternere alicui* is like *offerre* or *ante pedes projicere*.

[4] *quia forte non creditis;* these words are by some omitted, and I am inclined to think rightly; but if genuine, they apply only to the affirmation contained in the epithet *vero*.

XLIV. [1] *impendimur;* this word is synonymous with *erogamur*, it is used in precisely the same sense de Spectac. c. 19. *magis competat innocenti dolere, quod homo par ejus tam nocens factus est, ut tam crudeliter impendatur;* i. e. "that his fellow-man should have deserved so cruel a punishment."

[2] *Erogare* meant originally to disburse or expend, and was specially applied to any expenditure of *public* money—it here means *expended* or *spent*, as being put to death. Compare de Præs. Hær. c. 2. *Febrem erogando homini deputatam, neque quia est, miramur: est enim: neque quia erogat hominem: ad hoc enim est.* and c. 48. of this treatise, *non absumit (ignis) quod exurit, sed dum erogat, reparat.* In modern Spanish an exactly parallel use of the word *gastàr* (to spend) is

CAP. XLIV.

dispungitis[3]. Tot a vobis nocentes variis criminum elogiis recensentur; quis illic sicarius, quis manticularius[4], quis sacrilegus, aut corruptor, aut lavantium prædo[5], idem etiam Christianus adscribitur? aut cum Christiani suo titulo offeruntur, quis ex illis etiam talis, quales tot nocentes? De vestris semper æstuat carcer, de vestris semper metalla suspirant, de vestris semper bestiæ saginantur, de vestris semper munerarii noxiorum greges pascunt. Nemo illic Christianus, nisi hoc tantum, aut si et aliud, jam non Christianus.

And we, whom you thus condemn, are the only characters truly to be called innocent.

XLV. Nos ergo soli innocentes[1]. Quid mirum, si necesse est? Enimvero necesse est. Innocentiam a deo edocti, et perfecto eam novimus ut a

found, as applied to troops lost in an engagement, and I have seen the same phrase in English writers. In later times of the Roman empire, *erogare* by a very intelligible transition signified 'to disburse money in donatives or largesses,' till at length it becomes synonymous with *distribuere*; and *erogator* is found for the executor of a will or deed, i. e. as superintending the division of the property; and also for the almoner of an ecclesiastical foundation. *Roga* occurs in the various senses of a magistrate's salary, a soldier's bounty, or (in ecclesiastical language) a gift from the Pope *ad clerum*, or a collection of alms.

[3] *sententiis elogia dispungere*, i. e. "by passing sentence, to strike out from the calendar the name and charge of the criminal," v. c. 2. *debito pœnæ nocens expungendus est, non eximendus.* For the word *custodiis* see the note p. 34.

[4] *manticularius*. Festus: *manticularum usus pauperibus in nummis recondendis etiam nostro sæculo fuit, unde manticulare dicebantur qui furandi gratia manticulas attractabant*, where see Scaliger. *mantelia* appears in Virgil. *corruptor* (Juv. I. 77.) is synonymous with *perductor* above. From the arrangement of the sentence, Tertullian appears to be giving instances (*varia elogia*) antithetically, of grave and trivial offences. For *offerre*, see p. 8.

[5] *lavantium prædo.* This was a common character. See any glossary under *fur balnearius.*

XLV. [1] The argument is this: We only are the rightful claimants of the virtue of innocence; and though you may imagine this exclusive claim both

CAP. XLV. perfecto magistro revelatam et fideliter custodimus, ut ab incontemptibili dispectore mandatam. Vobis autem humana æstimatio innocentiam tradidit[2], humana item dominatio imperavit: inde nec plenæ nec adeo timendæ estis disciplinæ ad innocentiæ veritatem. Quanta[3] est prudentia hominis ad demonstrandum quid vere bonum? quanta auctoritas ad exigendum? tam illa falli facilis, quam ista contemni. Atque adeo quid plenius dictum est: non occides, an vero: ne irascaris quidem? Quid perfectius prohibere adulterium, an etiam ab oculorum solitaria concupiscentia arcere? Quid eruditius de maleficio, an et de maleloquio interdicere? Quid instructius, injuriam non permittere, an nec vicem injuriæ[4] sinere? dum tamen sciatis ipsas quoque leges vestras, quæ videntur ad innocentiam pergere, de divina lege ut antiquiore formam mutuatas.

Just. 12. 18.

presumptuous and false, yet, in point of fact, such is necessarily the case from circumstances; *quid mirum, si,* &c. means 'if the result is inevitable (as I shall shew), it cannot be any cause of wonder.'

[2] *vobis autem,* &c. "Nothing has introduced (*tradidit*) the virtue of innocence amongst you but human opinion, and nothing but mere human laws enjoin its practice, from which circumstance your discipline, as regards the conscientious sincerity of your innocence, is neither so perfect as ours, nor so terrible (*adeo timendæ*) in the penalties attached to its infraction." The student should observe the *copia verborum* in the expressions *plenius, perfectius, instructius, eruditius.*

[3] *quanta,* i. e. *quantula.*

[4] *injuria,* an aggression; *vices injuriæ,* a retaliation. In the next clause *dum tamen* introduces a kind of parenthetical remark of Tertullian, that even the inferior approximations to ethical perfection, for which he had just been giving the heathens credit, were themselves derived from Scripture. *pergere ad* means 'to tend towards,' like *ad elogium concurrere,* c. 24. The *ut* in the last clause of the sentence contains an implication of that argument from antiquity which I have spoken of in the Introduction.

CAP. XLV.

Diximus jam de Mosis ætate. Sed quanta auctoritas legum humanarum, quum illas et evadere homini contingat, et plerumque in admissis delitescere, et aliquando contemnere ex voluntate vel necessitate delinquendi, recogitata etiam brevitate supplicii cujuslibet, non tamen[5] ultra mortem remansuri? Sic et Epicurus omnem cruciatum doloremque depretiat[6], modicum quidem contemptibilem pronuntiando, magnum vero non diuturnum. Enimvero nos qui sub deo omnium speculatore dispungimur, quique æternam ab eo pœnam providemus, merito soli innocentiæ occurrimus[7], et pro scientiæ plenitudine, et pro latebrarum difficultate, et pro magnitudine cruciatus non diuturni, verum sempiterni, eum timentes, quem timere debebit et ipse qui timentes judicat, deum, non proconsulem timentes.

XLVI. Constitimus[1], ut opinor, adversus omnium criminum intentionem, quæ Christianorum sanguinem flagitat. Ostendimus totum statum nostrum, et quibus modis probare possimus ita esse, sicut ostendimus, ex fide scilicet et antiquitate divinarum litterarum, item ex confessione

But you say that our merits are simply those of the philosophers; attend then to a contrast of our schemes and conduct.

[5] *non tamen;* this refers to *cujus libet,* as if it had been written, *quod supplicium, sit cujus libeat generis, non tamen,* &c.

[6] *depretiare.* This word, I believe, is almost peculiar to Tertullian, or, at least, until much later times.

[7] *innocentiæ occurrimus;* I think Semler's explanation of this phrase is good, i. e. quasi inventam illam soli amplexuri. The *pro* in each clause means 'as regards, with respect to.' *scientiæ plenitudo* I conceive means, the perfect knowledge we have of the virtue, its nature, and what it requires from us, (sc. *a Deo edocti*) for *latebrarum difficultas,* see de pœnit. c. 3. *mediocritas humana de factis solum judicat quia voluntatis latebris par non est.*

XLVI. [1] *constitimus.* v. c. 4. *intentionem,* c. 27.

CAP. XLVI.

spiritualium potestatum[2]. Quis nos revincere audebit, non arte verborum, sed eadem forma, qua probationem constituimus de veritate? Sed dum unicuique manifestatur veritas nostra, interim incredulitas, dum de bono sectæ hujus obducitur[3],

[2] See c. 19—23. a little further down, *non arte verborum* alludes to practices common enough in the courts of Carthage, which are spoken of in c. 2. of the Introduction.

[3] *obducere*. I cannot offer any satisfactory explanation of the singular meaning which Tertullian gives to this word; that it is equivalent to *refellere*, or, to a more favourite expression of his, *revincere*, is unquestionably shewn by a passage in c. 2. de Resur. Car. *Obducti dehinc de Deo carnis auctore, et de Christo carnis redemptore, jam et de resurrectione carnis revincentur, congruenter scilicet*, where *revincentur* is obviously a repetition of the participle in the first clause, the assertion being that a disputant convinced of the two facts, will also be convinced of the third. The *de* simply means 'on the point of,' as in the text. But through what transition or metaphor *obducere* obtained this force, I cannot tell. It occurs frequently enough, and in the active as well as the passive voice. Semler seems to imagine that in the concluding chapter of this Apology it is used in a different sense, viz. that of *expungere*, and that it is a metaphor similarly taken from the tablets. The glossary of Ducange says that in the African writers it means *obfuscare, violare, lædere*, which significations are traceable enough, but no African writer is quoted there except Tertullian, and no passages which warrant the interpretation given. If its signification is really uniform in all passages where it occurs, I should be inclined to explain it by *expungere*, or at all events to connect it with that idea, as if used to express the striking out of one item from a series. Comp. the beginning of c. 19. de Car. Chr.

The argument of the text is: 'But their incredulity, although convinced on the score of the practical utility of our doctrines, which indeed is now well known even from the ordinary transactions of life, still denies the divinity of their source, and considers us simply as a new philosophical school.' The allusion here is to the very remarkable fact (of which we have other record besides this passage) that even during the keenest persecution of the Christians, their integrity in their dealings was acknowledged and made useful. And the difference between them and the philosophers, which very early appeared, was this, that

quod usui jam et de commercio innotuit, non utique divinum negotium existimat, sed magis philosophiæ genus. Eadem, inquit, et philosophi monent et profitentur, innocentiam, justitiam, patientiam, sobrietatem, pudicitiam. Cur ergo quibus comparamur de disciplina, proinde illis non adæquamur ad licentiam impunitatemque disciplinæ? vel cur et illi ut pares nostri non urgentur ad officia, quæ nos non obeuntes periclitamur? Quis enim philosophum sacrificare, aut dejerare, aut lucernas meridie vanas prostituere compellit? Quin imo et deos vestros palam destruunt, et superstitiones vestras commentariis quoque accusant, laudantibus vobis[4]. Plerique etiam in principes latrant sustinentibus vobis. Et facilius statuis et salariis[5] remunerantur, quam ad bestias pronuntiantur. Sed merito; philosophi enim non Christiani cognominantur. Nomen hoc philosophorum dæmonia non fugat. Quidni, quum secundum deos philosophi dæmonas deputent? Socratis vox est: si dæmonium permittat. Idem et quum aliquid de veritate sapiebat, deos

CAP. XLVI.

Just. XXVIII.

Just. IV.

their practice accorded with their precepts, whereas the contrary was most notoriously the case in all the schools of morality. Lactantius applies an entire chapter (D. I. III. 15.) to these considerations, and Seneca (de Vit. Beat. c. 18.) in meeting the same argument, excuses very ingeniously what he cannot contradict.

[4] *laudantibus vobis ...... sustinentibus vobis.* See the same artificial disposition of words in c. 15. *Luget Sol filium lætantibus vobis. Cybele pastorem suspirat non erubescentibus vobis.* It is preserved also in the tract ad Nationes.

[5] *salariis.* Pliny (XXXI. 7.) gives a derivation of this word: *Sal honoribus etiam militiæque interponitur, salariis inde dictis, magna apud antiquos auctoritate.* The word occurs in Seneca and Suetonius. *pronuntiantur;* the absolute use of this word for *pronuntiare sententiam* occurred twice in c. 2.

CAP. XLVI.

negans, Æsculapio tamen gallinaceum prosecari jam in fine[6] jubebat, credo ob honorem patris ejus, quia Socratem Apollo sapientissimum omnium cecinit. O Apollinem inconsideratum! Sapientiæ testimonium reddidit ei viro, qui negabat deos esse. In quantum odium[7] flagrat veritas, in tantum qui eam ex fide præstat offendit; qui autem adulterat et affectat, hoc maxime nomine gratiam pangit apud insectatores veritatis. Mimice philosophi affectant veritatem et affectando corrumpunt, ut qui gloriam captant: Christiani eam necessario appetunt et integre præstant, ut qui saluti suæ curant[8]. Adeo neque de scientia neque de disciplina, ut putatis, æquamur. Quid enim Thales ille princeps physicorum sciscitanti Crœso de divinitate certum renuntiavit, commeatus deliberandi sæpe frustratus[9]? Deum quilibet opifex Christianus et invenit et ostendit et exinde totum, quod in deo quæritur, re quoque assignat; licet Plato affirmet factitatorem universitatis neque inveniri facilem et inventum

[6] *in fine;* i. e. *jam morte præsente,* as de Anim. c. 1. Tacitus uses the verb; *sic Tiberius finivit.* The expression has been illustrated by Perizonius ad Valer. Max. II. 6. 7. A little afterwards *testimonium reddidit* is simply equivalent to *testificatus est,* though we had it with a very different meaning in c. 14.

[7] *odium.* Dr Ashton would read *odio,* so as to make *in quantum* merely answer to *in tantum,* I think, correctly.

[8] *saluti suæ curant.* So de Cult. Fœm. c. 1. *affectioni procurans,* and Apuleius (Apol. 420.) *solis hominibus, et eorum paucis curare.* Dr Ashton quotes instances of this regimen from Plautus, and, by a most extraordinary misconception, adds Hor. Epist. I. 2. 49. *Non animo curas,* probably quoting from memory.

[9] *commeatus sæpe frustratus;* i.e. "having repeatedly frustrated (employed unsuccessfully) the delays that were granted him." For *commeatus* see c. 32. *divinitas* in this passage means divinity in the abstract, as I have explained *divinitas vestra* in p. 90.

enarrari in omnes[10] difficilem. Ceterum si de pudicitia provocemus, lego partem sententiæ Atticæ in Socratem corruptorem adolescentium pronuntiatam. Sexum nec femineum mutat Christianus. Novi et Phrynen meretricem Diogenis supra recubantis ardori subantem. Audio et quendam Speusippum de Platonis schola in adulterio periisse. Christianus uxori suæ soli masculus nascitur. Democritus excæcando semetipsum, quod mulieres sine concupiscentia aspicere non posset, et doleret, si non esset potitus, incontinentiam emendatione profitetur. At Christianus salvis oculis feminam videt, animo adversus libidinem cæcus est. Si de probitate defendam, ecce lutulentis pedibus Diogenes superbos Platonis toros alia superbia deculcat: Christianus nec in pauperem superbit. Si de modestia certem, ecce Pythagoras apud Thurios, Zeno apud Prienenses tyrannidem affectant: Christianus vero nec ædilitatem[11]. Si de animi æquitate congrediar, Lycurgus ἀποκαρτέρησιν optavit, quod leges ejus Lacones emendassent: Christianus etiam damnatus gratias agit. Si de fide comparem, Anaxagoras depositum hospitibus denegavit: Christianus

CAP. XLVI.

[10] *enarrari in omnes*, to be explained to the multitude. This is in allusion to the esoteric and exoteric doctrines of the Platonic school. In all writings of the Platonists, especially on this point, the πεπαιδευμένοι and the ὄχλος are constantly contrasted. The *in* is the εἰς παντάς.

[11] *nec ædilitatem*; opposed antithetically to *tyrannidem*. This office—or at least a municipal ædileship, which must be that with which Tertullian was familiar,—seems to have had something peculiarly contemptible and ridiculous in it to ancient eyes, and is often quoted as a proverbial burlesque of official rank. See Juv. x. 102. Persius. I. 130.

CAP. XLVI.

etiam extra[12] fidelis vocatur. Si de simplicitate[13] consistam, Aristoteles familiarem suum Hermiam turpiter loco excedere fecit: Christianus nec inimicum suum lædit. Idem Aristoteles tam turpiter Alexandro regendo potius[14] adulatur, quam Plato Dionysio ventris gratia venditatur. Aristippus in purpura sub magna gravitatis superficie nepotatur[15], et Hippias, dum civitati insidias disponit, occiditur. Hoc pro suis omni atrocitate dissipatis nemo unquam Christianus tentavit. Sed dicet aliquis, etiam de nostris excedere quosdam a regula disciplinæ; desinunt tum Christiani haberi penes nos, philosophi vero illi cum talibus factis[16] in nomine et

[12] *etiam extra;* i. e. erga exteros. Even amongst those between whom and himself there is no bond of union. So in c. 7. they who are not Christians are termed *extranei.* As also in c. 31.

[13] *Simplicitas;* the example given shews that this word here is intended to mean humility and modesty of character.

[14] *regendo potius.* i. e. quem potius oportebat ab eo regi. the words must be closely connected; compare *ponendus,* Juv. III. 56. *venditatur*—"venalis est." Seml. I cannot help thinking that Tertullian is using this word in a deponent sense, and that it contains something like the phrase *venditare obsequium,* which occurs in Livy's story of the Bacchanalia. I take this opportunity of remarking, that Semler in his Lexicon interprets the expression *facinora vendidit,* which occurred p. 25, as *accepto pretio celavit,* which, as the reader will see on referring, is very different from my translation of it in the note. In defence of my own explanation I observe, that Semler's idea is already contained in the word *celavit,* to which Tertullian is evidently opposing *another* proceeding, *aut vendidit;* besides this, the *ipsos trahens homines* shews that not concealment but exposure is spoken of. The Vulgate has the same expression, Act. Apost. viii. 3. Saulus autem devastabat Ecclesiam, per domos intrans, et *trahens* viros ac mulieres, tradebat in custodiam.

[15] *nepotari,* i. e. nepotem agere; compare the use of *juvenari,* Hor. Ep. ad Pis. 246. In the following words the point of the sentence is contained in the parenthetical clause, *dum...disponit.*

[16] *cum talibus factis,* i. e. notwithstanding, in spite of such conduct.

CAP. XLVI.

in honore sapientiæ perseverant apud vos. Quid adeo simile philosophus et Christianus, Græciæ discipulus et cœli, famæ negotiator et salutis, verborum et factorum operator, rerum ædificator et destructor, interpolator erroris et integrator veritatis, furator ejus et custos.

Even the approximation to truth which philosophers make, is owing to our scriptures and doctrines.

XLVII. Adhuc[1] enim mihi proficit antiquitas præstructa divinæ litteraturæ, quo facile credatur thesaurum eam fuisse posteriori cuique sapientiæ. Et si non onus jam voluminis temperarem[2], etiam excurrerem in hanc quoque probationem. Quis poetarum, quis sophistarum, qui non de prophetarum fonte potaverit? Inde igitur philosophi sitim ingenii sui rigaverunt; nam quia quædam de nostris habent, ea propter nos comparant[3] illis. Inde, opinor, et a quibusdam philosophia legibus quoque ejecta est, a Thebanis dico, a Spartiatis et Argivis. Dum ad nostra conantur et homines gloriæ[4], ut diximus, et eloquentiæ solius libidinosi, si quid in sanctis offenderunt digestis, exinde regestum pro instituto curiositatis ad propria verterunt, neque satis credentes divina esse, quo minus interpolarent, neque satis intelligentes, ut adhuc tunc subnubila, etiam ipsis Judæis obumbrata, quorum propria vi-

XLVII. [1] *Adhuc enim,* &c. "For, in proving what I have advanced, the superior antiquity of the Scriptures which I before established, is a serviceable argument to me."

[2] *onus temperare.* In earlier Latin this would more probably have been *oneri;* but the accusative is like *temperare sumtus, annonam,* &c. *Excurrerem in hanc probationem;* 'I should run out into a proof of this assertion;'—another reading is *hâc probabatione,* which would mean: "I should, in establishing this proof, make a considerable digression."

[3] *comparant;* sc. nationes.

[4] *homines gloriæ ut diximus;* compare the whole sentence in c. 19. *gloriæ homines,* &c.

CAP. XLVII.

debantur. Nam[5] et si qua simplicitas erat veritatis, eo magis scrupulositas humana fidem aspernata mutabat, per quod in incertum miscuerunt etiam quod invenerant certum. Invento enim solummodo Deo, adeo non, ut invenerant, disputaverunt, ut de qualitate et de natura ejus et de sede disceptent. Alii incorporalem asseverant, alii corporalem, qua[6] Platonici, qua et Stoici; alii ex atomis, alii ex nu-

[5] *Nam et:* The word *mutabat* in this sentence is by many read *nutabat;* the meaning is as follows: For, even where the truth was stated in the most simple language, the natural sophistry of man, despising humble faith, changed it (or, perplexed itself with doubts), through which proceeding they confused with the doubtful doctrines even what they found perfectly clear.

The succeeding sentence I have read from Dr Ashton's conjecture, who takes *invento Deo* from ad Nat. II. 2, and conceives that the *adeo* was lost in the preceding *Deo*. His emendation, at all events, gives a tractable passage, which can hardly be said of the old text; "*Inventum enim solummodo Deum non ut invenerant disputaverunt, ut,* &c." The tense of *disceptent* refers to the actual present practice, (so *asseverant* just after) and the preceding perfects may be taken aoristically. *solummodo* means: After finding in the scriptures God *solely*, revealed as such, without any of those attributes concerning which they were inquisitive, &c.

[6] *qua Platonici,* &c. This sentence does not appear to be very satisfactorily constructed, but though the periods might be made to harmonize with but little alteration, yet it is hardly safe to attempt it. Dr Ashton suggests the omission of *qua* before *Stoici*, so that the sentence would run, *alii incorporalem asseverant, alii corporalem, qua Platonici et Stoici; alii ex atomis, alii ex numeris, qua Epicurus et Pythagoras;* but I think the double use of *qua* makes the real meaning more perspicuous, which, it may be observed, is not, that Platonists and Stoics asserted each both facts, but that philosophers held the incorporal, or corporal, nature of the Deity, according as they were Platonists or Stoics respectively. I should rather prefer the addition of *qua* before *et Pythagoras*. There seems too, a little variation in the exact sense of *qua* as the text now stands; in the first clause, *qua Platonici,* &c. it is evidently *qua tenus*, like *qua homines*, p. 110. (where see note); but in the next, *qua Epicurus*, it appears equivalent to *quemadmodum*.

CAP. XLVII.

meris, qua Epicurus et Pythagoras; alii ex igne, qua Heraclito visum est; et Platonici quidem curantem rerum; contra Epicurei otiosum et inexercitum, et ut ita dixerim, neminem[7] humanis rebus; positum vero extra mundum Stoici, qui figuli modo extrinsecus torqueat molem hanc; intra mundum Platonici, qui gubernatoris exemplo intra illud maneat, quod regat. Si et de ipso mundo natus innatusve sit[8], decessurus mansurusve sit, variant; sic et de animæ statu, quam alii divinam et æternam, alii dissolubilem contendunt: ut quis sensit, ita et intulit aut reformavit[9]. Nec mirum, si vetus instrumentum ingenia philosophorum interverterunt. Ex horum semine et nostram hanc novitiolam paraturam[10] viri quidam suis opinionibus ad philoso-

[7] ***neminem humanis rebus;*** others read *in humanis*, but not correctly. The case is the dative, and similar to the *illi* in c. 34. where see the note. The images in *figulus* and *gubernator* are those of a potter guiding his wheel from some position external to it, (*extrinsecus*); and of a pilot steering his vessel from a point within it.

[8] ***natus innatusve, decessurus mansurusve;*** These terms are equivalent to the *nativus* and *mortalis* of Lucretius; *decessurus* means *exitum habiturus*.

[9] ***ut quis sensit,*** &c. i. e. "According to the individual conclusion which each man comes to, he introduces (*intulit*) a fresh theory, or remodels an old one."

[10] ***novitiolam paraturam;*** I have before remarked (note p. 58.) on the convertibility of the terms *instrumentum* and *paratura*, which are here used with their respective epithets for the Old and New Testaments. "It is no wonder," says Tertullian, "if the philosophers perverted the Old Testament (*vetus instrumentum*), for men of the same class (*viri ex horum semine*) have distorted this our New Testament (*nostram hanc novitiolam paraturam*) to make it agree with philosophical doctrines (*ad philosophicas sententias*). Tertullian frequently asserts in his polemical writings that the Gnostics and other heretics of that class owe their birth to philosophy; in one passage he terms the philosophers *hæreticorum patriarchas*. As regards the letter of the text, *novitius*, of which *novitiolus* is a

CAP. XLVII. phicas sententias adulteraverunt, et de una via obliquos multos tramites et inexplicabiles sciderunt. Quod ideo suggesserim, ne cui nota varietas sectæ hujus in hoc quoque nos philosophis adæquare videatur, et ex varietate defensionum judicet veritatem. Expedite autem præscribimus adulteris nostris, illam esse regulam veritatis, quæ veniat a Christo, transmissa per comites ipsius, quibus aliquanto posteriores diversi isti commentatores probabuntur. Omnia adversus veritatem de ipsa veritate constructa sunt, operantibus æmulationem istam spiritibus erroris. Ab his adulteria hujusmodi salutaris disciplinæ subornata; ab his quædam etiam fabulæ immissæ, quæ de similitudine fidem infirmarent veritatis[11], vel eam sibi potius evincerent, ut quis ideo non putet Christianis credendum, quia nec poetis, nec philosophis, vel ideo magis poetis et philosophis existimet credendum, quia non Christianis. Itaque et ridemur deum prædicantes judi-

diminutive, occurs in Plautus, and the young student may observe that in late writers, and especially in the African Latinity, diminutives are used in profusion without implying any difference from the original word. Apuleius seems sometimes almost to confine himself to them.

In the succeeding sentence (*Quod ideo suggesserim*, &c.) the argument appears to be this: That experience had shewn the doctrines of philosophy to be essentially discordant and multiform; but that the principles of dissent were not intrinsic to Christianity, but derived in fact from the corruptions of philosophy; and that therefore the differences existing both in the one and the other were not of the same nature, and could not be compared. On the objections of this kind compare Origen, c. Cels. Lib. v. and VI. pp. 273, 282, ed. Cantab.

[11] *quæ de similitudine*, &c. i. e. which should lessen the credit of truth from their own similarity to it (as if necessarily either both or neither were credible), or rather, should put in an exclusive claim to it. Compare the opening of the treatise adv. Prax.

caturum. Sic enim et poetæ et philosophi tribunal apud inferos ponunt. Si gehennam comminemur, quæ est ignis arcani subterraneus ad pœnam thesaurus, proinde decachinnamur. Sic enim et Pyriphlegethon apud mortuos amnis est. Et si paradisum nominemus, locum divinæ amœnitatis recipiendis sanctorum spiritibus destinatum, maceria quadam igneæ illius zonæ a notitia orbis communis segregatum, Elysii campi fidem occupaverunt[12]. Unde hæc, oro vos, philosophis aut poetis tam consimilia? non nisi de nostris sacramentis: si[13] de nostris sacramentis, ut de prioribus, ergo fideliora sunt nostra, magisque credenda, quorum imagines quoque fidem inveniunt; si de suis sensibus, jam ergo sacramenta nostra imagines posteriorum habebuntur, quod rerum forma non sustinet; nunquam enim corpus umbra aut veritatem imago præcedit.

CAP. XLVII.

XLVIII. Age jam, si quis philosophus affirmet, ut ait Laberius de sententia Pythagoræ, hominem fieri ex mulo, colubram ex muliere, et in eam opinionem omnia argumenta eloquii[1] virtute detorserit, nonne consensum movebit et fidem infiget etiam ab animalibus abstinendi? propterea que persuasum quis hoc habeat, ne forte bubulam de aliquo proavo

Yet you receive their idle fables of transmigration of souls, though you deny our tenet of the resurrection of the body.

[12] *occupare* is used in its peculiar sense, 'to anticipate.'

[13] *si de nostris*, &c. The argument is this: the poets derived these ideas either from our doctrines, or their own inventions; if from the former, they are later than ours, and therefore if they find credit as copies (adumbrations, *imagines*) *a fortiori* should ours as originals; if from the later, we must conclude our ideas (of earlier date) to be copies of theirs (of later date), which is absurd, and inconsistent with the nature of things (*quod rerum forma non sustinet*).

XLVIII. [1] *eloquii*, the genitive depends on *virtute*. *propterea que persuasum*, i. e. propterea sc. ne obsonet.

CAP. XLVIII.

suo obsonet. At enim Christianus, si de homine hominem ipsumque de Caio Caium reducem repromittat, lapidibus magis, nec saltem[2] calcibus a populo exigetur? Quasi[3] non, quæcunque ratio præest animarum humanarum in corpora[4] reciprocandarum, ipsa exigat illas in eadem corpora revocari; quia hoc est revocari, id esse quod fuerant. Nam si non id sunt, quod fuerant, id est, humanum[5] et id ipsum corpus indutæ, jam non ipsæ erunt, quæ fuerant. Porro quæ jam non erunt ipsæ, quomodo rediisse dicentur? Aut, aliud factæ, non erunt ipsæ, aut, manentes ipsæ, non erunt aliunde. Multis etiam jocis et otio opus erit, si velimus ad hanc partem lascivire, quis in quam bestiam reformari videretur. Sed de nostra magis defensione[7]

[2] *nec saltem calcibus*, i. e. "if not with kicks."

[3] *Quasi non.* 'As if, whatever argument there was for the re-incarnation of souls, the same did not necessarily demand the identity of the body.'

[4] *in corpora*, i. e. in corpora quælibet.

[5] *humanum et id ipsum corpus; humanum* as opposed to the Pythagorean theory of promiscuous transmigration, *id ipsum* as opposed to those who would confine the metempsychosis to humanity, but not insist on the identity of the flesh.

[6] *non erunt aliunde;* In the foregoing sentence the case is stated thus; that the very idea of the resurrection of the soul implies necessarily its resurrection with its own body, inasmuch as the two facts are inseparable; "for either, having migrated (*aliud factæ*) they will not be the *animæ* in question and therefore cannot be said to have risen again at all, or, being identical (*manentes ipsæ*) they will not be derived from any other individual (*aliunde*)." The whole of this passage exists with readings too various to be the result of accident, and seems to confirm the hypothesis previously mentioned, that there was a double edition of the Apology.

[7] *Sed de nostra magis defensione;* i. e. "But (instead of luxuriating in fancy) to return to our own proper defence;"—I have adopted the punctuation given above from a suggestion of Dr Ashton's.

CAP. XLVIII.

qui proponimus, (multo utique dignius credi,) hominem ex homine rediturum, quemlibet pro quolibet, dum hominem, ut eadem qualitas animæ in eandem restauretur conditionem, etsi non effigiem; certe, quia ratio[8] restitutionis destinatio judicii est, necessario idem ipse qui fuerat exhibebitur, ut boni seu contrarii meriti judicium a deo referat. Ideoque repræsentabuntur et corpora, quia neque pati quicquam potest anima sola sine stabili materia, id est carne; et quod omnino de judicio dei pati debent animæ, non sine carne meruerunt, intra quam omnia egerunt. Sed quomodo, inquis, dissoluta materia exhiberi potest? Considera temetipsum, o homo, et fidem rei invenies. Recogita quid fueris, antequam esses: utique nihil; meminisses[9] Just. 25.
enim, si quid fuisses. Qui ergo nihil fueras, priusquam esses, idem nihil factus quum esse desieris, cur non possis esse rursus de nihilo ejusdem ipsius auctoris voluntate, qui te voluit esse de nihilo? Quid novi tibi eveniet? qui non eras, factus es; quum iterum non eris, fies. Redde si potes rationem, qua factus es, et tunc require, qua fies. Et tamen facilius utique fies, quod fuisti aliquando,

[8] *certe quia ratio,* &c. The meaning of this clause seems to be that the resurrection of the identical body was a condition of the future judgment. In c. 4. de Test. An. Tertullian says, *nulla ratio sit judicii, sine ipsius exhibitione qui meruit judicii passionem.* The subject will be found treated of in the tract de Resurr. Carnis, and somewhat differently in the second book of Arnobius. It is hardly necessary to direct attention to the eloquence of the succeeding passage, *considera temetipsum,* &c.

[9] *meminisses.* There is possibly some allusion to the Platonic theory, alluded to also by Arnobius in the passage above quoted.

CAP. XLVIII.

quia æque non difficile[10] factus es, quod nunquam fuisti aliquando. Dubitabitur, credo, de dei viribus, qui tantum corpus hoc mundi de eo quod non fuerat, non minus quam de morte vacationis et inanitatis composuit[11], animatum spiritu omnium animarum animatore, signatum et per ipsum humanæ resurrectionis exemplum in testimonium vobis. Lux quotidie interfecta resplendet, et tenebræ pari vice decedendo[12] succedunt, sidera defuncta reviviscunt, tempora ubi finiuntur, incipiunt, fructus consumuntur et redeunt; certe semina non nisi corrupta et dissoluta fecundius surgunt[13]? omnia pereundo servantur, omnia de interitu reformantur. Tu homo, tantum nomen, si intelligas te, vel de titulo Pythiæ discens, dominus omnium morientium et resurgentium ad hoc morieris, ut pereas? Ubicunque resolutus fueris[14], quæcunque te materia destruxerit, hauserit, aboleverit, in nihilum prodegerit, reddet te. Ejus[15] est nihilum ipsum, cujus et totum. Ergo, inquitis, semper moriendum erit, et semper resurgendum. Si ita rerum dominus des-

[10] *æque non difficile;* there appears to be no doubt about this reading, and yet it can scarcely be correct; Dr Ashton suggests a very good emendation in the margin; *quia æque, quod difficilius,* &c. but adds that he would rather totally reject the words as a gloss. The argument itself, *plus est fecisse quam refecisse,* has been repeatedly urged by the Fathers.

[11] *Terra autem erat inanis et vacua.*

[12] *decedendo succedunt* merely means 'go and come,' as if it had been 'postquam decesserint, succedunt rursus.'

[13] 1 Cor. xv. 36. *Insipiens, tu quod seminas, non vivificatur, nisi moriatur.*

[14] *Ubicunque resolutus fueris;* i. e. "into whatever substance you may have been resolved." The expression is common in Lucretius.

[15] *ejus est nihilum;* "That *nothing* itself just spoken of, is under the dominion of the same Master as is the universe."

tinasset, ingratis experieris conditionis[16] tuæ legem. At nunc non aliter destinavit, quam prædicavit. Quæ ratio universitatem ex diversitate composuit, ut omnia ex æmulis substantiis sub unitate constarent ex vacuo et solido, ex animali et inanimali, ex comprehensibili et incomprehensibili, ex luce et tenebris, ex ipsa vita et morte: eadem ævum[17] quoque ita destinata ac distincta conditione conseruit, ut prima hæc pars ab exordio rerum, quam incolimus, temporali ætate ad finem defluat, sequens vero, quam expectamus, in infinitam æternitatem propagetur. Quum ergo finis et limes medius, qui interhiat, affuerit, ut etiam mundi ipsius species transferatur æque temporalis, quæ illi dispositioni æternitatis aulæi vice oppansa est: tunc restituetur

[16] *conditionis tuæ legem;* "the law of your creation," see note, p. 63.

[17] *eadem ævum,* &c. The expression *ævum* here is not like *seculum* in c. 26. but implies the whole space included both in this life and the future, of which the *prima hæc pars* (i. e. *sæculum*) is finite, and the *sequens pars* infinite, and the *distincta conditio* is in the ordinary sense of the substantive, and not that occurring above. As there is some little difficulty in the passage I subjoin a general paraphrase: "That Reason which called forth Unity out of Discord, and the Universe out of Chaos, created also Time under these laws, viz. that its first division, which we are spending, dating from the beginning of the world, should be finite and run rapidly to its close, and that its second, which we look for, should be eternal. When therefore the boundary gulf which yawns between these two periods, shall have arrived, and the time too for the passing away (*transferatur:* so Vulg. *cœlum et terra transibunt,* S. Matth. xxiv. 35.) of this world, which is no less mortal than ourselves, but is hung like a drop-scene before the system of eternity—then shall mankind be restored to render a lasting account of their deeds." Tertullian's description of *ævum* here is something analogous to that of *vita* mentioned by Lucan (I. 457.) as believed by the Druids,

> .... longæ (canitis si cognita) vitæ
> Mors media est.

CAP. XLVIII. omne humanum genus ad expungendum, quod in isto ævo boni seu mali meruit, et exin dependendum in immensam æternitatis perpetuitatem. Ideoque nec mors jam, nec rursus ac rursus resurrectio, sed erimus iidem qui nunc, nec alii post: dei quidem cultores apud deum semper, superinduti substantia propria æternitatis; profani vero et qui non integri ad deum[18], in pœna æque jugis ignis, habentis ex ipsa natura ejus, divina scilicet, subministrationem incorruptibilitatis. Noverunt et philosophi diversitatem arcani et publici ignis. Ita longe alius est qui usui humano, alius qui judicio dei apparet, sive de cœlo fulmina stringens, sive de terra per vertices montium eructans; non enim absumit, quod exurit, sed dum erogat, reparat. Adeo manent montes semper ardentes[19], et qui de cœlo tangitur, salvus est, ut nullo jam igni decinerescat. Et hoc erit testimonium ignis æterni, hoc exemplum jugis judicii, pœnam nutrientis: montes uruntur et durant. Quid nocentes et dei hostes?

You honour them and persecute us, whereas in any case we can have deserved no

XLIX. Hæc sunt, quæ in nobis solis præsumptiones vocantur, in philosophis et poëtis summæ scientiæ et insignia ingenia. Illi prudentes, nos inepti, illi honorandi, nos irridendi, imo eo

[18] *integri ad deum;* i. e. *apud*, as often in earlier writers. S. Luc. i. 6. *erant autem ambo justi ante Deum.*

[19] de Pœnit. c. 12. *Quid illum thesaurum ignis æterni æstimamus cum fumariola quædam ejus tales flammarum ictus suscitent ut proximæ urbes aut jam nullæ extent, aut idem sibi de die sperent. Dissiliunt superbissimi montes ignis intrinsecus fetu, et quod nobis judicii perpetuitatem probat, cum dissiliant, cum devorentur, nunquam tamen finiuntur.* The word *erogare* has been explained in p. 146.

CAP. XLIX.

amplius et puniendi. Falsa nunc sint quæ tuemur, et merito præsumptiones, attamen necessaria; inepta, attamen utilia; si quidem meliores fieri coguntur[1] qui eis credunt, metu æterni supplicii et spe æterni refrigerii. Itaque non expedit falsa dici, nec inepta haberi, quæ expedit vera præsumi. Nullo titulo damnari licet omnino[2] quæ prosunt. In vobis

more severe visitation than ridicule.

XLIX. [1] *Falsa nunc sint*, &c. The argument of this passage appears at first sight to rest on that plea of *expediency* which has been so much canvassed in modern times, but such is not really the case, and indeed no possible kind of reasoning could be more diametrically opposed to Tertullian's principles. The direct end of this Apology must closely be borne in mind, viz. the attainment of something like toleration and justice for the Christians. No attempt is made, except indirectly and unavoidably, to convert others, or to offer a system of evidences; all that Christianity is made to demand is *ne ignorata damnetur*, and with *this* view Tertullian argues that even making every possible concession of the emptiness or untruth of the religion, still no warrant can be found for persecution and cruelty, and that the beneficial influences which it is admitted to exert, ought at all events to secure it from any thing more violent than ridicule. It may be remarked, that Arnobius when employing (1. extr.) this same argument does so in connexion with the same expostulations: *non placet* (he says) *ea quæ dicit* (Christus) *et cum offensionibus audiuntur a vobis; pro ludicris ea vaticinationibus computate: stolidissimas res loquitur et fatua dona promittit; ridete ut sapientes vos viri et in suis erroribus fatuitatem relinquite volutari:* and he had been previously urging the expediency of Christianity, though not precisely on the grounds of the text; but he proceeds in his next sentences to shew clearly with what aim he is writing in this particular passage, though the general tone of his work is didactic and argumentative; *Quænam est ista crudelitas inhumanitasque tanta*, &c. The expression *coguntur* alludes to that compulsory or inevitable improvement caused by Christianity which was mentioned in the note p. 115.

[2] *damnari licet omnino;* I prefer connecting *omnino* closely with *damnari*, and giving the meaning of the whole sentence thus: on no charge whatever (*nullo titulo*) can any scheme deserve unconditional condemnation (*damnari omnino*) which is proved to be beneficial. The *hæc ipsa præsumptio* a little lower means 'that identical presumption with which you charge us,'

CAP. XLIX.

itaque præsumptio est hæc ipsa, quæ damnat utilia. Proinde nec inepta esse possunt, certe etsi falsa et inepta, nulli tamen noxia; nam et multis aliis similia, quibus nullas pœnas irrogatis, vanis et fabulosis, inaccusatis et impunitis, ut innoxiis. Sed in ejusmodi errores, si utique, irrisu judicandum est, non gladiis et ignibus, et crucibus, et bestiis; de qua iniquitate sævitiæ non modo cæcum hoc vulgus exsultat et insultat, sed et quidam vestrum[3], quibus favor vulgi de iniquitate captatur, gloriantur, quasi non totum, quod in nos potestis, nostrum sit arbitrium. Certe, si velim, Christianus sum: tunc ergo me damnabis, si damnari velim; quum vero quod in me potes, nisi velim, non potes; jam meæ voluntatis est quod potes, non tuæ potestatis. Proinde et vulgus[4] vane de nostra vexatione gaudet; proinde enim nostrum est gaudium, quod sibi vindicat, qui malumus damnari, quam a deo excidere; contra illi qui nos oderunt, dolere non gaudere debebant, consecutis nobis quod elegimus.

You admire their obstinacy,

L. Ergo, inquitis, cur querimini, quod vos insequamur[1], si pati vultis, cum diligere debeatis, per

præsumptio meaning literally a decision on insufficient grounds, and without due information.

[3] *sed et quidam vestrum;* i.e. "even some of you, who are educated men, in authority;" these are the parties to whom the Apology was addressed, who are elsewhere apostrophized as *antistites* and *præsides;* and the same contrast between them and the *vulgus* is drawn in p. 121.

[4] *proinde et vulgus;* the word *proinde* is used in different senses in this passage, in its first place it signifies simply πρὸς ταῦτα (like *licet nunc* in the next chapter), in the second it is taken in a way which we have more than once met with in this treatise, *proinde enim nostrum est,* meaning *gaudium enim, quod sibi vindicat vulgus, tam est nostrum quam ipsius.*

L. [1] On the sense of *insequamur,* see note p. 10.

quos patimini quod vultis? Plane volumus pati, verum eo more, quo et bellum miles: nemo quidem libens patitur, cum et trepidare et periclitari sit necesse; tamen et proeliatur omnibus viribus, et vincens in proelio gaudet, qui de prœlio querebatur, quia et gloriam consequitur et prædam. Prœlium est nobis, quod provocamur ad tribunalia, ut illic sub discrimine capitis pro veritate[2] certemus. Victoria est autem, pro quo certaveris, obtinere. Ea victoria habet et gloriam placendi deo et prædam vivendi in æternum. Sed obducimur[3]; certe cum obtinuimus: ergo vicimus, cum occidimur; denique evadimus, cum obducimur. Licet nunc sarmenticios et semaxios[4] appelletis, quia ad stipitem dimidii axis revincti sarmentorum ambitu exurimur. Hic est habitus victoriæ nostræ, hæc palmata vestis; TALI CURRU TRIUMPHAMUS. Merito itaque victis

CAP. L.

yet you sneer at our endurance; but our deeds, and sufferings gain more converts than any efforts or enticements of theirs.

[2] The sentiments contained in this chapter will be found in the tracts ad Martyres, and ad Scapulam, and are repeated by most of Tertullian's successors, especially Cyprian and Lactantius. In the edict of Antoninus an expression exactly parallel to the text occurs. νικῶσι προϊέμενοι τὰς ψυχάς. (Euseb. Hist. IV. 13). Some remarks will be found in the introduction, on the frequency of these military metaphors and illustrations.

[3] *obducimur,* see note p. 150. *obtinuimus,* sc. caussam. v. de Spect. c. 18. *Quod si et stadium contendas in scripturis nominari, sane obtinebis.* Arnobius (I. init.) uses *obtinuisse caussam;* and (II. 36.) employs the word absolutely for *revincere: possimus obtinere non esse Deo a superiore prolata tam supervacua,* with which compare IV. 8.

[4] *sarmenticii et semaxii;* The former of these words occurs in the Scriptores Rei Rusticæ, but of course in a more natural sense. The idea of the following clause has been borrowed by Lactantius (de M. P. 16) but far less forcibly and sententiously conveyed. *Quam jucundum illud spectaculum Deo fuit cum te victorem cerneret, non candidos equos aut immanes elephantos, sed ipsos potissimum triumphatores currui tuo subjugantem. Hic est verus triumphus, cum dominatores dominantur.*

CAP. L.

non placemus; propterea enim desperati et perditi existimamur. Sed hæc desperatio et perditio penes vos in caussa gloriæ et famæ vexillum virtutis extollunt[5]. Mucius dextram suam libens in ara reliquit: o sublimitas animi! Empedocles totum sese Catanensium Ætnæis incendiis donavit[6]: o vigor mentis! Aliqua Carthaginis conditrix rogo secundum matrimonium dedit: o præconium castitatis! Regulus, ne unus pro multis hostibus viveret[7], toto corpore cruces patitur: o virum fortem et in captivitate victorem! Anaxarchus, quum in exemplum ptisanæ pilo contunderetur, tunde, tunde, aiebat, Anaxarchi follem, Anaxarchum enim non tundis: o philosophi magnanimitatem, qui de tali suo exitu etiam jocabatur! Omitto eos qui cum gladio proprio aliove genere mortis mitiore de laude pepigerunt[8]; ecce enim[9] et tormentorum certamina coronantur a vobis. Attica meretrix, carnifice jam fatigato, postremo linguam suam comestam in faciem tyranni sævientis exspuit, ut exspueret et

[5] *vexillum virtutis extollunt.* This phrase seems to mean, that obstinacy and bigotry, when displayed in mere human matters, adopt the insignia, and are allowed the honours, of real virtue.

[6] *donavit* v. ad c. 39.

[7] *ne unus,* &c. In order that his life might not be secured to his country, at the expence of several lives restored to the enemy; the *cruces toto corpore* relates to the manner of his death, and is perhaps antithetically opposed to the simple crucifixion which the Christians endured.

[8] *pepigerunt de laude;* have contracted with suicide (as it were) for fame; the phrase has occurred before; see note p. 12.

[9] *ecce enim et,* &c. The idea seems to be, that possibly deliberate suicide might in heathen eyes claim the credit of fortitude, and that therefore Tertullian takes a stronger case of greater ignominy (*et tormentorum certamina*) and shews that even to such as these a due meed of praise (*coronantur*) was allowed.

vocem, ne conjuratos confiteri posset, si etiam victa voluisset. Zeno Eleates consultus a Dionysio, quidnam philosophia præstaret, quum respondisset, contemptum mortis, flagellis tyranni subjectus sententiam suam ad mortem usque signabat. Certe Laconum flagella, sub oculis etiam hortantium propinquorum acerbata, tantum honorem tolerantiæ domui[10] conferunt, quantum sanguinis fuderint. O gloriam licitam, quia humanam, cui nec[11] præsumptio perdita nec persuasio desperata deputatur in contemptu mortis et atrocitatis omnimodæ; cui tantum pro patria, pro agro, pro imperio, pro amicitia pati permissum est, quantum pro deo non licet! Et tamen illis omnibus et statuas defunditis[12] et imagines inscribitis et titulos inciditis in æternitatem; quantum de monumentis potestis[13] scilicet, præstatis et ipsi quodammodo mortuis resurrectionem. Hanc qui veram a deo sperat, si pro deo patiatur, insanus est. Sed hoe agite, boni præsides, meliores multo apud populum, si illis Christianos immolaveritis. Cruciate, torquete, damnate, atterite nos. Probatio est enim innocentiæ nostræ iniquitas vestra. Ideo nos hæc pati deus patitur. Nam et proxime ad

[10] *domui;* to the family.

[11] *cui nec,* &c. i. e. to whose account is set down (*deputatur*) neither obstinacy nor infatuation, even while it is scornfully despising (*in contemptu*) every kind of torture and death.

[12] *defunditis;* i. e. liquente metallo. *inciditis,* see note p. 100. Cic. in Verr. IV. 34. *in qua grandibus literis* P. AFRICANI *nomen erat incisum, eumque* KARTHAGINE CAPTA RESTITUISSE *perscriptum.*

[13] *quantum de monumentis potestis;* this *de* means 'as far as you can secure the end by means of monuments,' or, more literally, 'as far as your power extends, which is thus derived;' we have before had *valere de aliquo. resurrectio* seems to mean the surviving after death, like the *non omnis moriar,* &c.

CAP. L.

lenonem damnando Christianam potius, quam ad leonem, confessi estis labem pudicitiæ apud nos atrociorem omni pœna et omni morte reputari. Nec quicquam tamen proficit exquisitior quæque crudelitas vestra, illecebra est magis sectæ. Plures efficimur, quoties metimur[14] a vobis: semen est sanguis Christianorum. Multi apud vos ad tolerantiam doloris et mortis hortantur, ut Cicero in Tusculanis, ut Seneca in Fortuitis[15], ut Diogenes, ut Pyrrhon, ut Callinicus. Nec tamen tantos inveniunt verba discipulos, quantos Christiani factis docendo[16]. Illa ipsa obstinatio, quam exprobratis, magistra est. Quis enim non contemplatione ejus concutitur ad requirendum, quid intus in re sit? quis non, ubi requisivit, accedit? ubi accessit, pati exoptat, ut totam dei gratiam redimat, ut omnem veniam ab eo compensatione sanguinis sui expediat? omnia enim huic operi delicta donantur. Inde est, quod ibidem sententiis vestris gratias agimus; ut est æmulatio divinæ rei et humanæ, cum damnamur a vobis, a deo absolvimur.

[14] *metimur:* the expression occurs in Virgil and other poets.

[15] *Seneca in Fortuitis;* This was a tract written by Seneca, de Remedio Fortuitorum, ad Gallionem. A treatise purporting to be this identical composition is printed in most editions of Seneca (Vol. v. p. 427. ed. Ruhnk.) in the *Excerpta.* It is obviously not genuine, but, with the exception of the commencement (Lips. Elect. I. 26.) it is tolerably good Latin, and a singularly clever piece of declamation.

[16] *tantos quantos* for *tot—quot* as in c. 1. *factis docendo* must be taken closely together, meaning by their practical example.

INDEX VOCABULORUM.

